


B
839
W38

SP



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2025 with funding from
Graduate Theological Union

JOSEPH WATZLAWIK, S.V.D., PH.D.

University of San Carlos

Cebu City

Philippines

LEO XIII

AND

THE NEW SCHOLASTICISM



THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN CARLOS

(Divine Word University)

CEBU CITY

PHILIPPINES

B
839
W38

SAN CARLOS PUBLICATIONS

EDITORS

GERTRUDES ANG
JOSEPH BAUMGARTNER, S.V.D.
VICENTE BRAGANZA, S.V.D.
JOSEPH GOERTZ, S.V.D.
BRIGIDA KOPPIN

HUBERT LOEBACH, S.V.D.
RUDOLF RAHMANN, S.V.D.
MICHAEL RICHARTZ, S.V.D.
FRIEDRICH SCHARPF, S.V.D.
JOHN VOGELGESANG, S.V.D.

SERIES D: OCCASIONAL MONOGRAPHS

NUMBER ONE

With the appearance of this monograph
SERIES D of SAN CARLOS PUBLICATIONS
is initiated.

This series is devoted to monographs which may or may not be on Philippine topics in the humanities but are expected to contribute to the general knowledge of interested readers.

THE UNIVERSITY OF SAN CARLOS
(Divine Word University)
CEBU CITY
PHILIPPINES

TABLE OF CONTENTS

CHAPTER	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	vii
The Problem	vii
Preliminary Definition	xi
I. HOW NON-SCHOLASTICS VIEW SCHOLASTICISM	
OLD AND NEW	1
Training of Most Contemporary Philosophers in Non-Catholic Philosophy	2
Adverse Factors External to Scholasticism	3
The Very Philosophic Character of Scholastic Philosophy Doubted	6
II. CAUSES OF THE DECLINE OF SCHOLASTICISM	12
Claims of Rationalist Historians	12
Friedrich Paulsen	13
Wilhelm Dilthey	14
Rudolf Eucken	15
No Complete Interruption of the Scholastic Tradition	17
True Humanism	19
Decline of Scholasticism	25
Intrinsic causes	28
Extrinsic causes	35
III. THE REVIVAL OF SCHOLASTICISM	39
Italy	42
Spain	48
Germany	50
France	56
Switzerland	60
Belgium	61
Eastern Europe	66
England	66
The United States of America	67
Canada	71
IV. CAUSES OF THE REVIVAL AND FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOLASTICISM	76
The Mind's Basically Metaphysical Disposition .	76
The Failure of Contemporary Systems	78
The Study of History	83
The Study of Aristotle	87
The Influence of the Popes	95
The Trend of Modern Thought Towards the Scholastic Position	104
The Religious Trend	108

V. SCHOLASTICISM	110
Byzantine Philosophy	112
Arabian Philosophy	113
Jewish Philosophy	115
Western Philosophy	116
Scholastic Philosophy	118
Doctrinal Characteristics of Scholastic Philosophy	120
Summary Definition	131
VI. NEO-SCHOLASTICISM	132
Elimination of False Notions	135
History of Philosophy	137
Sciences	138
Metaphysics	140
Epistemology	140
Natural Theology	141
Philosophy of Nature	142
Psychology	143
VII. LEO XIII AND NEO-SCHOLASTICISM	146
The Encyclical "Aeterni Patris"	152
Scholastic Philosophy Is the True Philosophy ..	159
The Period of the Apologists	159
The Patristic Period	160
The Scholastic Age	161
The Argument	163
Other Documents	167
Leo XIII's Approval of Mercier's Conception of the Restoration	169
L'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie	171
Mercier's Views Opposed	177
Reversal of Situation	182
Argument	184
VIII. LEO XIII AND THOMISM	187
Supreme Doctrinal Authority of St. Thomas ...	188
Kinds of Doctrinal Authority	188
Personal Qualities of St. Thomas	188
The Works of St. Thomas	190
The Extrinsic Authority of St. Thomas	195
Kinds of Thomism	203
CONCLUSION	208
BIBLIOGRAPHY	211
APPENDIX I	218
APPENDIX II	219
INDEX OF NAMES	221

INTRODUCTION

The history of science gives sufficient proof of the relentless endeavor of the human mind to conquer reality. It shows, how, within the course of time, the human search endeavored to unveil more and more of reality and penetrate deeper and deeper into its constitution. As a result we see an expansion and broadening of the existing sciences, or the rise of new sciences out of the old ones. The search for truth has most remarkably expressed itself in the field of Philosophy, the systematic efforts of the human mind to find, by its own light, ultimate truths through ultimate causes. Its history reveals that here human endeavor did not move on in a straight continual progress or even in a spiral ascent; the history of philosophy shows the way of the human mind as a series of ups and downs in the course of the centuries through a variety of systems. Intellectual speculation has expressed itself, at times, in bizarre doctrines, or in systems diametrically opposed to each other, because they are the results of action and reaction. It passed through periods of continually and clearly constructive development ending in the most brilliant results of intellectual speculation, or through periods with trends so different as to make almost impossible any attempt at classification.

The second half of the last century witnessed the rise of a philosophical trend that was opposed to the extremes of idealism and materialism and kept itself within the boundaries of moderate realism. It became known as Neo-Scholasticism or New Scholasticism or Modern Scholasticism or "the Philosophy of the Catholic Church: The Neo-Thomism."¹

THE PROBLEM

Regarding the nature of that new philosophical trend there still exists "quite a crowd of prejudices. . . and many talk about

¹Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1951), Vol. IV, p. 628.

it without understanding it.”² Since, however, it plays a very significant part in the march of contemporary thought and represents an intellectual movement that may not be ignored, this purpose suggested itself for the present study: to define, at least by the most general yet intrinsic characteristics, the doctrine of the New Scholasticism.

The representatives of the neo-Scholastic movement were inspired by, and drew from, the treasures of the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages. Hence it has often been argued whether the New Scholasticism really represents a development leading to substantial additions, raising new problems, and offering solutions not known to the Scholastics of the Middle Ages, or is merely a revival of the philosophy of the Scholastics of the Middle Ages.

Leo XIII exerted one of the most profound influences on the rise and development of the neo-Scholastic trend. As is well known, he was a pronounced admirer and follower of the philosophy of St. Thomas, the Angelic Doctor, in whose writings Scholasticism reached its culmination. But it cannot be said that all Scholastic tenets, or all tenets of Scholasticism, are at the same time also Thomistic tenets; Scholasticism is not identical with Thomism. The neo-Scholastic movement “has sometimes been called neo-Thomism partly because St. Thomas Aquinas in the thirteenth century gave to Scholasticism among the Latins its final form, partly because the idea has gained ground that only Thomism can infuse vitality into twentieth century Scholasticism. But Thomism is too narrow a term; the system itself is too large and comprehensive to be expressed by the name of any single exponent.”³

The present study, therefore, proposes to answer these questions: 1) What is Neo-Scholasticism? 2) Is it really a Neo-Scholasticism or a mere revival of medieval Scholasticism? 3) Did Leo XIII favor the revival of Scholasticism in general or did he wish a revival of Thomism in the strict sense?

²M. De Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New* (Dublin: M.H. Gill & Son, Ltd., 1907), p. vii.

³M. De Wulf, “Neo-Scholasticism,” *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: 1913), X, p. 746.

The usefulness of the study becomes apparent from the role which philosophical ideas or whole philosophical systems play in the determination and the molding of the intellectual, moral, religious, social, and political life of an epoch. The ideological background of its culture is to a great extent formed by the dominant philosophical current or currents of that epoch.

La Historia de la Filosofía, considerada sobre todo en relación con la de la cultura nos muestra que las ideas filosóficas ejercen una gran influencia en la vida y la conducta humana; que las sanas doctrinas pueden disponer el camino para un feliz desenvolvimiento del hombre en los terrenos moral, social y religioso, y que, por el contrario, una filosofía perversa puede producir en las otras esferas de la vida perniciosísimos efectos.⁴

When the late Popes spoke of the miseries and troubles of their times, they also referred to perverse philosophical ideas as the roots of these strifes and evils.

Who so turns his attention to the bitter strifes of these days and seeks a reason for the troubles that vex public and private life, must come to the conclusion that a fruitful cause of the evils which now afflict, as well as of those which threaten us, lies in this: that false conclusions concerning divine and human things, which originated in the schools of philosophy, have crept into all the orders of the State, and have been accepted by the common consent of the masses. For since it is in the very nature of man to follow the guide of reason in his actions, if his intellect sins at all his will soon follows; and thus it happens that looseness of intellectual opinion influences human actions and perverts them. Whereas, on the other hand, if men be of sound mind and take their stand on true and solid principles, there will result a vast amount of benefits for the public and private good.⁵

⁴Federico Klimke, *Historia de la Filosofía* (Barcelona: Editorial Labor, S. A., 1947), p. 827.

⁵Leo XIII, Encyclical Letter "Aeterni Patris," Aug. 4, 1879, in: *The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), p. 35. Cf. also p. 52

Pius XI adds to the statement of the source of all evils of his time the correspondent remedy:

...ad errores effugiendos, in quibus omnium huius temporis miseriarum fons est et caput, religiosius quam umquam alias, est in Aquinatis institutione consistendum.⁶

It is, therefore, of greatest importance that a sound philosophy be the ground and well spring of the intellectual, moral, social, and political life of any period of time, a philosophy that is natural to the human mind because it is a natural and consistent development and systematical unfolding of common sense. The outlook on the world as a whole, and on life in particular must, unless it is to become arbitrary and fantastic, be under the control of the intellect as guided by universal and eternal truths.

It is just because the philosophy that forms our intellectual environment so easily influences our whole being that it is so important that the student and seeker after truth should be equipped with a sound philosophy. Yes, a philosophy that grips facts and holds fast to them when it is brought into play in the domain of metaphysics, when it soars to the absolute. The philosophy of Aristotle, developed and defined by St. Thomas Aquinas, has pre-eminently the characteristic of healthy, sound realism."⁷

In order that this sound philosophy be able to exercise its influence and fashion culture, it must be made known, popularized, understood, and esteemed. The fact, however, is that Scholastic philosophy which claims to be the philosophy of common sense, that is, a system of thought based upon the unchanging principles of the *philosophia perennis*, is, even today, not sufficiently known, or widely misunderstood, or is looked at with great indifference, or even uncritically rejected. And this fact seems to justify a new attempt at its exposition.

Much of the negative or indifferent attitude towards Scho-

⁶A. A. S., Vol. 15, p. 322.

⁷Cardinal Mercier, *Modernism* (London: Burns & Oates, 1912), p 13.

lastic philosophy is due to ignorance. James B. Pratt,⁸ of Williams College, declared:

I think the feeling of most non-Scholastic philosophers of my acquaintance toward Scholasticism is neither friendly nor unfriendly, but rather one of complete neglect and indifference, and too often one of very great ignorance.

Contact and acquaintance with Scholasticism begets deep respect for it. S. Alexander,⁹ of the University of Manchester, wrote:

To my profound regret, I have only a superficial and second-hand knowledge both of Scholastic and Neo-Scholastic philosophy. Whenever I do come into direct contact with them I feel the real loss which such ignorance entails.

And R. F. Alfred Hoernle,¹⁰ of the University of Witwatersrand, was led to remark:

What little I know, mostly at second-hand, of Scholastic philosophy, and especially of the teaching of St. Thomas Aquinas, has always filled me with respect for its thoroughness and intellectual power.

PRELIMINARY DEFINITION

According to Cicero a scientific study should start from the definition of its object that one may know what is the point of discussion.¹¹ In a preliminary way, then, Neo-Scholasticism may be described as the philosophical reaction which started about the middle of the last century in the principal countries of Europe against empiricism, positivism, and materialism on the one hand, and idealism, especially in the form of Neo-Kan-

⁸John S. Zybura, *Present-Day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism* (St. Louis, Herder, 1927), p. 51.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 79. Cfr. pp. 20; 22.

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 97.

¹¹"Omnis enim, quae a ratione suscipitur de aliqua re institutio, debet a definitione proficisci, ut intelligatur, quid sit id, de quo disputatur." Cicero, *De Officiis*, I, 2.

tianism and immanentism, on the other, and vigorously defended realism. It sought a new connection with the Middle Ages in order to make use of the rich patrimony left by the great masters of the Middle Ages. This reaction manifested itself as a revival of the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages. It was to be, according to its representatives, a development of the medieval Scholasticism and its application to modern problems, the "restatement in our own day of the *philosophia perennis* which, elaborated by the Greeks and brought to perfection by the great medieval teachers, has never ceased to exist even in modern times."¹² Hence, Neo-Scholasticism is taken here to be the "Scholastic Renaissance" which took place after the second decline of Scholasticism in the eighteenth and the first half of the nineteenth centuries as distinguished from the first renaissance in the sixteenth century after the first decline of Scholasticism in the second half of the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries.¹³

This study suggested itself in view of the existing ignorance of, indifference towards, and prejudices against, the Scholastic system of thought. Hence it will start with a presentation of the way non-Scholastics are wont to look at Scholasticism, both old and new. It will thereby prove the earlier statement that Scholasticism, even in the form of its recent development, is still unknown or misunderstood by many. The prejudices against it proceed from a knowledge of the degenerated Scholasticism as it existed during its first decline. Acquaintance with the general causes of the decline will be helpful for understanding this degenerate philosophy and at the same time prepare for the understanding of the promotive forces of the reaction. The fact and actual course of the reaction will appear from a short history of the development which will be followed by a presentation of its causes. Thereupon a doctrinal definition of the movement will be attempted. Since the move-

¹²M. De Wulf, "Neo-Scholasticism," *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, 1913), X, p. 746.

¹³The term "neo-Scholastic", implying a revival of Scholastic doctrines, is equally applied to theology which has gone through a parallel development. In this study, however, it is used only in its application to philosophy.

ment purports to be an adaptation of the principles of medieval Scholasticism to modern problems and conditions, the characteristics of Scholasticism, not *qua* medieval but *qua* Scholasticism, have to be pointed out and contrasted against these adaptations to new conditions. From a discussion of the innovated elements, we may determine whether or not the movement is justified in using the name of "Neo-Scholasticism." Finally, it will have to be shown whether Leo XIII and the succeeding popes, in their active promotion of Scholasticism, intended to have a revival of Scholasticism in general or Thomism in the strict sense of the term.

LEO XIII
AND
THE NEW SCHOLASTICISM

CHAPTER I

HOW NON-SCHOLASTICS VIEW SCHOLASTICISM

OLD AND NEW

There was a time when the conviction was quite common and dominant that to study medieval philosophy was to waste time and effort;¹ for it was taken for granted that the philosophy of the Middle Ages was the "handmaid of theology" to such an extent as to be practically indistinguishable from it, and that, in any way, "philosophy amounted to little more than barren logic-chopping and word-play." Human reason in the Middle Ages, it was believed, was chained by heavy fetters because ecclesiastical authority reigned supreme. This depreciative view of medieval philosophy was but a part of the disesteem in which the Middle Ages in general were held: the long night of a thousand years, the period with the mentality of a backward civilization wherein reason, philosophy, was but a slave. That contemptuous attitude had to change by the force of the light which the historic studies of neo-Scholastics threw on the "Dark Ages." But far from being dispelled, the vague conceptions about the Middle Ages still cloud the minds of many. Paradoxically, men who claim to possess scientific training, who speak in bold terms of the scientific temper of our era and insist upon the requirements of science in the admission of tenets, who dismiss with ridicule or an air of superiority matters of Revealed Truth, these same men most credulously accept the legend of the dark night of the Middle Ages and unscientifically pass judgment on what they never took the trouble to look into.

¹"Not so many years ago, people who knew little or nothing about it (Scholastic philosophy), either laughed at it or considered it a waste of time to think about it. How little it was understood may be seen from a letter of Huxley's boast (sic) that he had mastered in one summer afternoon the whole argument of Suarez respecting evolution. He, who did not know the first word of the technology of that subject. . ." Sir Bertram Windle, in John S. Zybura, *Present-Day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism*, (St. Louis: Herder Book Co., 1927), p. 92.

John S. Zybura² published, in their original form, the replies of thirty-three professors to a questionnaire on the attitude of non-Scholastic philosophers towards Scholastic philosophy submitted to sixty-five professors of philosophy in the leading non-Catholic universities of the United States, Great Britain, and Canada. The questionnaire requested expression of opinion on the following points:

Reason for the unfriendliness or indifference towards it (Scholastic philosophy), — whether they are to be found in the content, or method, or other aspects of that philosophy; the contributions which it can make towards the solution of contemporary problems; present prospects for a *rapprochement* between it and other currents of present-day understanding and closer cooperation in the domain of Philosophy.³

While those professors pointed out much in favor of Scholasticism, they frankly admitted that there was comparative or very great ignorance of Scholasticism, much neglect of, indifference, unfriendliness to, and prejudice against it among students, scientists, among the general educated public, and among many of the philosophers themselves as regards the finer meaning of Scholastic philosophy.⁴

To explain this attitude different professors gave different reasons of the non-Scholastic philosophers themselves, reasons stemming from factors external to Scholasticism itself.

1. Most contemporary philosophers were raised in the non-Catholic philosophy of either the eighteenth or nineteenth centuries which was largely a reaction against Thomism.⁵

Dominated by a thorough-going rationalism and faith in the evolving character of thought as present-day teachers in philosophy are, they have usually regarded all medieval philosophy as outworn and kept alive only by the *imprimatur* of the Roman Catholic Church. Being in sympathy with Liberalism as against

²John S. Zybura, *Present-Day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism*. (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1927)

³*Ibid.*, p. XI.

⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 42 (E. L. Hinman); 51 (James B. Pratt); 52 (William K. Wright); 56 (Ralph M. Blake); 67 (A. E. Taylor).

⁵*Ibid.*, p. 3 (Ralph Barton Perry).

Fundamentalism they feel themselves to be emancipated as regards the traditional theology or Church doctrine of any kind.⁶ The thinkers of many of the Western Colleges are influenced by pragmatism but the pragmatic temper, because opposed to all metaphysics, is perhaps the greatest influence working against the study of Scholastic philosophy. The Protestant-trained philosophers believe Scholasticism to be working wholly by authority; the democratic Protestant and most of all the pragmatist hates the idea of authority.⁷

2. Among other adverse factors external to Scholasticism were mentioned:

a) the Latin Language. A. E. Taylor,⁸ of Edinburgh University wrote:

I am afraid the mere fact that the great Scholastics wrote in Latin⁹ and used a highly elaborated terminology which is remote from the terminology shaped in later times by the influence of all sorts of points of views in the sciences unknown before the great advance made in the seventeenth century, inevitably stands in the way.

There are no texts available that are intelligible to the normal youth.¹⁰ Neo-Scholastic works of serious importance and genuine ability in the English language can still practically be counted on the fingers... even these are chiefly outlines, text-books, and compendia.¹¹

b) Scholastic terminology is forbidding and often defines problems in a fashion that has little relation to the contemporary approach.¹²

c) The manner of exposition is rather repelling.¹³ Besides

⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 21 and 19 (H. C. Longwell).

⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 12-13 (Wilmon H. Sheldon); cfr. pp. 29-30 (John Dewey); 39 (H. B. Alexander).

⁸*Ibid.*, p. 67

⁹Prof. William K. Wright of Dartmouth College admits: "and our Latin is rusty" *Ibid.*, p. 53

¹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 17 (Charles M. Blake).

¹¹*Ibid.*, pp. 57 (Ralph M. Blake); 38 (Joseph A. Leighton).

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 32 (Edgar S. Brightman).

¹³*Ibid.*, pp. 56, 58 (Ralph M. Blake); 22 (H. C. Longwell); 30 (John Dewey); 38 (Joseph A. Leighton); 68 (A. E. Taylor).

being dryly abstract and logical, it rarely seems to "be fully abreast of modern non-Scholastic discussions of the topics dealt with. There is a tendency to present the Scholastic views with insufficient depth and clearness; to give inadequate attention to a thorough explanation of the grounds upon which these views rest; to neglect to relate the Scholastic views to other contemporary views of the same problem, and to give careful and impartial consideration to such objections as really weigh in the minds of their present-day critics."

The non-Catholic philosopher is not accustomed to the dialectic of Scholasticism, but is trained in science and critical analysis. The result is that he has little taste for the rigor of formal logic, and his real faith lies in the way of empiricism.

The Scholastic method seems too rationalistic and not sufficiently empirical to appeal to one school of contemporary thought, while those who are rationalistically inclined seem to prefer at present to follow the model set by recent mathematics. The method of St. Thomas, in particular, seems to be "too predominantly *authoritarian* and *deductive*;" analysis is over-elaborated.

d) Scholasticism is believed to neglect observation, to make too slight use of the results of natural science and to be seemingly unwilling to recognize the importance of scientific facts.¹⁴ Its independence of experience appears to the temper of the present age, which is empirical, experimental, and conditional, as the great defect of Scholasticism. Hence "there is the feeling that to a very large extent the Schoolmen are spending their time in making subtle formal distinctions to which nothing empirically real corresponds... it is hard to convince students that the Schoolmen are not trying to spin truth out of their own interior, like the spider with whom Francis Bacon compared them."

To the modern man, whose point of view is historical, political, adventurous, who wishes to know how things have come about and in what direction they are tending, Scholastic philo-

¹⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 50 (James B. Pratt); 8 (William Ernest Hocking); 68 (A. E. Taylor); 75-6 (G. Santayana); 5 (Ralph Barton Perry).

sophy, which is analytical of things and their static properties, can hardly appeal, because its subject-matter is remote from his interest, and the problems it studies are not those that puzzle him or seem to him vital. Because of the alleged independence of experience and disregard of natural science, which is advancing, Scholastic philosophy is considered to be stationary and unprogressive. While philosophy has outgrown the great Scholastics and moved forward, it is felt that contemporary adherents of the Scholastic system are living in the past, and that we have, therefore, nothing to learn from them. Medieval philosophy has little that is new or valuable; it is believed that all its conclusions are anticipated in Greek philosophy and the writings of the early Christian Fathers; it is an antiquated system of thought.

Besides, Scholastics do not seem to be really engaged in an open-minded search for truth to be discovered in the exploitation of reality, rather, their conclusions are held to be determined in advance, because they are defending a system, and a system that is suspected of having other foundations than purely rational ones. Ralph Barton Perry,¹⁵ of Harvard, wrote:

It is generally believed that the outcome of Scholastic philosophizing is determined in advance, and that the processes of reasoning are therefore somewhat of an empty show. Furthermore, no non-Scholastic philosophers that I know of believe that the Scholastic proofs are real proofs — or believe that the deductive method can be carried through in metaphysics.

While modern science feels itself free to investigate any possible subject without prejudice as to conclusions,¹⁶ it is further claimed, the modern defenders of Scholastic philosophy give the impression of an unwillingness to grapple with problems with the freedom of an open mind seeking truth, as if they assumed that the book of reason was closed and that they held the keys, and could speak with authority and from a different plane than that occupied by all other philosophers.

¹⁵*Ibid.*, p. 4; cfr. pp. 7 (William Ernest Hocking); 12 (Wilmon H. Sheldon); 16 (A. K. Rogers).

¹⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 39 (H. B. Alexander) and 18 (Charles M. Bakewell).

3. The very philosophic character of Scholastic philosophy is doubted.

A method which involves deduction from accepted truths is distasteful to the scientific temper. I am inclined to think, however, that the existence of the censorship and Index forms the greatest obstacle of all: it is difficult to take as genuine a philosophy which is expressed under such formal restrictions.¹⁷

It is believed that Scholastic philosophy is essentially an apologetic system, that is, devised to lend support to doctrines accepted on other grounds, such as those of authority or faith. Neo-Thomists and Neo-Scholastics are not really thinking for themselves but merely re-editing a system which they accept on non-philosophical grounds.¹⁸

Hence, "the feeling that the Scholastic cannot inquire freely and empirically," since "the presence of the principles of authority as offering a source of finished truths which reason might support, and to some extent re-interpret, but not deviate from in substance," is felt to fix conclusions too much in advance. Scholasticism as a philosophy, according to the views of the philosopher of average acquaintance with thought in the Middle Ages, is bound up with the Roman Catholic Church, and therefore under constraint and hindering the free movement of reason as such. The same is thought to be the case with Scholasticism in its more recent form, or Neo-Scholasticism.

This subjection of Scholasticism to, and dependence on, authority, it is contended, clearly manifests itself in the unphilosophical adherence of Scholastics to, and their overemphasis of, the system of St. Thomas who has become an authority in a sense in which free thinking and an autonomous intellect can acknowledge no authority.¹⁹ For this reason it does not appeal to the non-Scholastics who study thoroughly any and all of the great philosophers, any and all of the vexed cultural

¹⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 39-40 (H. B. Alexander).

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 4 (Ralph Barton Perry); 13 (Wilmon H. Sheldon); 7 (William Ernest Hocking); 19-20 (H. C. Longwell).

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 5 (Ralph Barton Perry); 22-23 (H. C. Longwell); 43 (E. L. Hinman); 47 (George H. Mead); 88 (G. S. Brett).

questions, and try to distill the truth for today from such discussion. The Scholastics concentrate chiefly on one system, Thomism, within which there exists no place for unshackled scientific questioning, investigation, and imagination.

This principle of authority appears to have rendered static and immobile the Scholastic mind and seems to offer a justification of the opinion that Scholasticism spells "the mentality of a backward civilization" and that "Scholastic has become a synonym for the out-of-date, the naive, the scientifically worthless."²⁰

Even as far as natural grounds are concerned, Scholasticism appears to have built on scientifically limited and imperfect foundations.²¹ Since the formation of the main tenets of Scholasticism the natural sciences have developed remarkably. The starting points of Scholasticism were to some extent superseded in the period of the Renaissance. The results of science, now almost universally accepted, have changed the entire outlook on the Scholastic problems in regard to the physical world, its philosophy of nature, and its philosophy of history. Hence, as Jay William Hudson²² puts it,

"Most academic philosophers regard Scholasticism as a dead issue, of historical interest only, representing a stage in the history of philosophy — an important stage — that has served its purpose.

²⁰M. De Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New* (Dublin: M. H. Gill & Son, Ltd., 1907), p. 3. The same author cites on p. 164 J. Frohschammer, *Die Philosophie des Thomas von Aquino kritisch gewuerdigt*: "In the actual circumstances we are called upon not merely to criticize a theoretical system but to destroy the practical influence which the philosophy of Thomas has acquired since he has been proclaimed commander-in-chief of the Scholastic forces. The papacy, allied with Jesuitism, is utilizing these forces to the utmost for the purpose of carrying on a struggle to the death against all modern philosophy, all modern science and even against civilization itself; and that, in order to erect upon their ruins the temporal supremacy of the papacy as well as the scholastic science and civilization of the Middle Ages."

²¹Zyburga, *op. cit.*, pp. 30 (John Dewey); 7 (William Ernest Hocking); 35 (Walter Goodnow Everett); 3 (Ralph Barton Perry).

²²*Ibid.*, p. 48. Cfr. p. 3. Friedrich Paulsen, *System der Ethik*⁸, 1906, I, p. 339, wrote: "Scholastic philosophy has passed away, we do not value it any more; this is no proof against its own value; did it make the generations that lived in the second half of the Middle Ages more understanding and wise, . . . then it achieved all that could be expected from it; then, after having completed its task, it was allowed to be laid to rest; there is no philosophy of everlasting value." Quoted by Josef Donat, *Die Freiheit der Wissenschaft* (Regensburg: Fel. Rauch, 1925), p. 62.

And therefore “a system that has had its day.”

While the non-Scholastics are believed to be in substantial agreement that “philosophy is a progressive unfolding of human thought in the process of civilization, and that complete finality never is or can be reached,”²³ Scholastics seem to claim their system to be a final or definitive system. The engagement of non-Scholastics “with the succession of syntheses, in the history of thought, tends to check confidence in any synthesis as final. Hence they regard Thomism as not meriting the implicit confidence accorded to it by Catholic thinkers.” Where philosophies of everlasting flux prevail, there cannot but be impatience with an intellectual world in which well ordered systems, to remain eternally valid, are striven for; because “we shall never overcome the disposition of reason to produce varieties of doctrine, nor should we wish to do so.”

Such were and are the charges and objections against Scholasticism, old and new alike, which were brought forth as reasons for the ignorance of, or indifference and hostility towards it. Many of them are puerilities; other charges are more serious and even to the extent of being denials of Scholasticism as an independent philosophical science. A radical expression of this view was given by M. Penjon:²⁴

If philosophy is, as we have defined it, a free search, we may say that from the edict of Justinian (529) to the Renaissance in the fifteenth century there is a sort of interval during which there is, properly speaking, no philosophy... We should, therefore, in a history of philosophy, simply skip that interval of eight or nine centuries and pass directly to study the researches that prepared the way for the modern philosophy.

Most of the views are but a perpetuation of the prejudices and hostilities of the humanists, and men like Rabelais, Francis Bacon, Descartes, and Locke who “had at their disposal a veritable arsenal of cheap sneers. They made full use of these

²³*Ibid.*, pp. 34 (Walter Goodnow Everett); 22-23 (H. C. Longwell); 8-9 (William Ernest Hocking).

²⁴M. Penjon, *Précis d'histoire de la philosophie* (Paris; 1897), p. 165, cited by M. De Wulf, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

and passed them on to the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries;"²⁵ and they haunt minds even in the twentieth century. It is astonishing that the non-Scholastic philosophers, while they insist on "an open-minded search for truth," on an investigation of "any possible subject without prejudice as to conclusions," and an unbiased approach of a problem, themselves commit the very inconsistency of assuming an attitude towards Scholastic philosophy, old and new, which is not based on the investigation of the subject, but rather on belief^{25a} and feeling.^{25b}

For some generations, nay for centuries, they have been attacking and aspersing the origins, structure, and tendencies of that philosophy, whilst remaining wholly ignorant of, or misconstruing, its spirit and the very principles on which it is founded. Such an attitude may well cause amazement,²⁶

What Gilson²⁷ wrote of his own teachers of philosophy may be applied to many others:

Since, however, it had become clear to me that, technically speaking, the metaphysics of Descartes had largely been a clumsy overhauling of scholastic metaphysics, I decided to learn metaphysics from those who had really known it, namely, those very Schoolmen whom my own professors of philosophy felt the more free to despise as they had never read them.

²⁵M. De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1926), I, p. 3. A little earlier the same author wrote: "Medieval Philosophy did not escape the sarcasms of the Humanists. Erasmus, Vives, and Cornelius Agripa ridiculed it. The Reformers of the sixteenth century encouraged these ideas, and the epithet "scholastic" became one of contempt. According to Thomasius, for instance, Scholasticism was a philosophy which was taught in bad Latin, abused the syllogism, and busied itself with subtleties of foolish trifles. Or, again, it was described as a philosophy which pretended to follow Aristotle but did not understand him. And since all systems of philosophy after the sixteenth century loudly boasted of their independence of dogma, Scholasticism was dismissed as a system used in defense of the Catholic religion or of the theology of Popery; *can esse philosophiam in servitute theologiae Papaeae (sic) redactam...* The same contempt and the same ignorance are found in the opinions of the modern period concerning Scholasticism." *Ibid.*, pp. 1-2.

^{25a}"It is generally believed, Zybur, *Op. cit.* p. 4, 12, 13

^{25b}"It is felt," "there is a general feeling," Zybur, *op. cit.* pp. 5, 13, 57, 89.

²⁶Jacques Maritain, "The Contemporary Attitude Towards Scholasticism," in John S. Zybur, *op. cit.*, pp. 185-6.

²⁷Etienne Gilson, *God and Philosophy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1951), p. xiv.

Numerous quotations in proof of similar and often much stronger views of Scholasticism among German Philosophers were collected by Martin Grabmann in *Die Geschichte der Scholastischen Methode*.^{27a}

A recent proof of the statement that Scholasticism is not duly regarded even in our days was furnished by the recently published *Concise Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy and Philosophers*.²⁸ This "high-level popular handbook" was written by forty-six British and four American philosophers.^{28a} In the presentation of contemporary thinkers most well-known British and American figures are included, although those in the empirical and analytic traditions are notably preferred. But most of the continental European philosophers are inadequately covered. What is especially hard to understand and justify is "that the article on 'Metaphysics' should, in typical nineteenth-century fashion, skip directly from Aristotle to Descartes and that neither the name nor the doctrine of any medieval thinker should be mentioned anywhere throughout its eleven columns,"²⁹ since the work claims to be an *Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy and Philosophers*.

Another example of a wrong view of Scholasticism is presented by Punya Sloka Ray in his article "Reflection on the Philosophic Life."³⁰ He writes:

A fourth way (of philosophy) is that of taking an external authority as one's final foundation. The freedom of questioning fundamental assumptions is surrendered in favour of a freedom to compete and cooperate in producing technically more and more perfect analyses and syntheses, reductions and systematizations, rhetorically and pedagogically more and more effective introductions, expositions,

^{27a}(Freiburg i. Br.; Herder, 1909), I, chapters 1 and 2.

²⁸James Opie Urmson, ed., *The Concise Encyclopedia of Western Philosophy and Philosophers* (New York: Hawthorn Books, 1960), pp. 431.

^{28a}This explains why British current interests in philosophy are primarily reflected in the contents and American views only secondarily.

²⁹*International Philosophical Quarterly*, 1:350, May, 1961.

³⁰Punya Sloka Ray, "Reflection on the Philosophic Life," *Philosophy Today*, 7:115-123, Summer 1963.

catechisms, applications, handbooks, encyclopedias. This is to turn philosophy into Scholasticism. Scholasticism needs a set of dogma that can be derived from different sources.³¹

In her article "Thomism Today," in *The Commonweal*, Rosemary Lauer³² does "some semantic spadework" to bring out the "many shades of meaning" the term "Thomism" has. According to the definition of Thomism "in certain circles" a Thomist is "an unphilosopher who thinks he is a philosopher because he has always had all the answers, though he has never had a question." Almost all members of the species are Catholic; and most Catholic unphilosophers are Thomists and their natural habitat is the thirteenth century.

³¹*Ibid.*, p. 119.

³²*The Commonweal*, 80: 38, April 3, 1964.

CHAPTER II

CAUSES OF THE DECLINE OF SCHOLASTICISM

In the history of Scholastic Philosophy the thirteenth century is generally considered the Golden Age; the fourteenth and the fifteenth centuries are described as a period of decline of Scholastic philosophy. The unfavorable views of Scholasticism, which many in our own days still hold, as was shown in the preceding chapter, may be traced to the humanists who considered only the Scholasticism of their own time, and mainly its negative side. The predominant attitude towards contemporary Scholasticism was that of contempt which found its expression in sarcasm and sneer. Granted that there was a decline, to what extent did Scholasticism degenerate, and which were its causes?

According to rationalist circles Scholasticism not only deteriorated but disintegrated, and this disintegration had its cause within the system itself.¹ The decline began in the middle of the fourteenth century and "continued on its downward course in proportion as the new movements were reaching their meridian" until it entirely ceased to have any living influence on subsequent movements of thought and life. "Scholasticism has passed," heralded Friedrich Paulsen.² And this passing of Scholasticism as a philosophy was, according to them, inevitable because its very spirit and fundamental content was in direct opposition to the innermost spirit, the essential view, the dominant tendency of the new life and thought which burst in and asserted itself during the Humanism-Renaissance period as the new *Zeitgeist*, and finally dealt the death blow to Scholasticism. Rationalist interpretation sees this radical antithesis between the medieval spirit and the new *Zeitgeist* in the op-

¹Cfr. Jos. Kleutgen, *Die Philosophie der Vorzeit* (Innsbruck: Fel. Rauch, 1878), I, pp. 313 f. Otto Willmann, *Die Geschichte des Idealismus* (Braunschweig: Friedrich Vieweg und Sohn, 1907), II, pp. 545 ff.

²See note 22 in the preceding chapter.

position between transcendence and immanence: the standpoint of Scholasticism was theocentric and other-worldly, that of the new movements anthropocentric and this-worldly. In the medieval philosophic conception of reality God is the true source from which all beings proceed and on which they depend, hence also the true center from which all reality and history must be viewed in order to be understood and explained. The new concept fixes the center in man or nature: for the idealists the point of departure in all problems is man and the absorption of nature in man; for the positivists, nature and the comprehension of man in nature. The ideal of the new movements is perceived in the emancipation and glorification of man: of his greatness, power, rights, independence, self-consciousness in the spirit of his awakening to the sense of his autonomous and central position in the universe. This naturally produces the individualistic and autonomous, anthropocentric and naturalistic bent, which manifests itself in the effort to thoroughly emancipate reason from faith, the natural from the revealed, the individual from the universal and hierarchical. Rationalist philosophers see the essence of Scholasticism in the peculiar relation of authority to reason, and hence present its development and (alleged) final dissolution according to the actual development of this relation.

Friedrich Paulsen finds the fertile soil of Scholasticism in the desire to build faith and reason into one unified system or to derive from reason the fundamental articles of the doctrinal system of the Church. The aim of Scholastic philosophy was to prove the reasonability of the faith of the Church and its harmony with scientific knowledge.³ "Scholastic theology was,

³"das Verlangen, Glauben und Wissen in ein einheitliches System zusammenzutragen oder die Grundartikel des kirchlichen Lehrsystems aus der Vernunft abzuleiten." (*Philosophia militans*, 3rd, and 4th ed., Berlin 1908, p. 33) "Den Glauben der Kirche als einen vernuenftigen und mit der wissenschaftlichen Erkenntnis im grossen uebereinstimmenden zu erweisen, das war das Ziel der scholastischen Philosophie, ..." (*Die deutschen Universitaeten*, Berlin 1902, pp. 35-36). "Die scholastische Theologie ist und will seine rationale Theologie; sie erkennt die Offenbarung und den Glauben der Kirche an, aber sie sucht eine hoehere Form fuer denselben Inhalt; sie will, aehnlich wie es spaeter die Hegelsche Philosophie versucht, den Glauben umsetzen und auflösen in Wissen, in ein dialektisch-spekulatives Erkennen: fides quaerens intellectum, so hatte schon Anselmus das Programm formuliert, was denn ohne innere Wandlung auch des Glaubens selbst nicht ab-

and wanted to be, rational theology. It recognized Revelation and the faith of the Church, but it sought after a higher form for the same content. It wanted, as later on Hegelian Philosophy tried, to translate and resolve faith into reason, into a dialectico-speculative understanding: *fides quaerens intellectum*. Thus Anselm already had formulated the program; but this could not be achieved without intrinsically changing that faith itself. The adherence to tradition, and the desire to lean upon authority, form a strange contradiction to that rationalism. It was the inner split resulting from this contradiction which, at the end of the Middle Ages, led to the disintegration of the Scholastic system."

Wilhelm Dilthey sees the essence and value of medieval thought in the close combination of dialectic and metaphysics with theology. But he finds the combination of metaphysics with theology in Scholasticism somewhat external and superficial. "The task to harmonize the great realities of Christianity and the representations (concepts) expressing them with Greek, especially Aristotelian, metaphysics was understood by them (the Scholastics) superficially, because the deeper meaning (motives) of Greek metaphysics remained inaccessible to them."⁴ According to him, the concepts of the ancient philosophers as used by the Scholastics are like uprooted plants in a herbarium whose original places and environment are unknown. Those concepts have been brought into connection with other entirely incompatible ones. While, according to him, the dominant party of the hierarchy considered the content of faith as transcending reason and hence as a reality confronting our corrupted na-

ging. Zu diesem Rationalismus bildet einerseits das Haften an der Tradition, das Verlangen nach einer Anlehnung an eine Autoritaet einen seltsamen Gegensatz: der hieraus entspringende innere Zwiespalt war es, der am Ausgang des Mittelalters zur Aufloesung der scholastischen Systeme fuehrte.' (*Philosophia militans*, p. 37), quoted by Martin Grabmann, *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herdersche Verlags-handlung, 1909), pp. 4-5.

⁴"Die Aufgabe, die grossen Realitaeten des Christentums und die Vorstellungen, in welche diese ausgedrueckt waren, mit der griechischen, insbesondere aristotelischen Metaphysik zu vereinigen, ist von ihnen (den Scholastikern) aeusserlich gefasst worden, weil ihnen die tieferen Beweggruende der griechischen Metaphysik unzugaeenglich waren." (Einleitung in die Geisteswissenschaften, I, Leipzig: 1883, p. 342) in Martin Grabmann, *op. cit.*, p. 6.

ture through the authority of Revelation, there was another tendency, inspired by Anselm of Canterbury and ultimately traceable to Augustin, which held that in every, even the most sublime, mystery of faith there is a rational nexus knowable only on the supposition of faith. Now, in the effort to orientate itself in the transcendental world and develop the rational nexus of the contents of faith, the intellect encounters, in the most important points, contradiction upon contradiction instead of a proper satisfactory formula of exposition. It is the intrinsically contradictory character of medieval metaphysics which constitutes the basic cause of Scholastic decomposition.

Rudolf Eucken also sees in Scholasticism a combination of Aristotelian philosophy with Christian doctrine whereby, however, the genuine Aristotelianism is watered down and robbed of its original vigor. He finds the reason for this emasculation of original Aristotelianism in Scholasticism in the difficulty to harmonize Aristotelian philosophy with Christianity. The Aristotelian system in its original peculiarity to conclude within this world does not lend itself as a first step to a religious conviction. The unification of Aristotelian philosophy and Christian doctrine requires, according to Eucken, a watering down, a colorless expression of both. The difficulty of a synthesis of Aristotle and Christianity manifests itself in the merely mechanic juxtaposition of both world views, and the absence of an organic assimilation. In the Middle Ages the worlds of thought do not appear as living unities, the peculiar spirit of which reaches down into their farthest ramifications; rather, they are dissolved into a juxtaposition of separate sentences which may be grouped or joined in this or that way, harmonized with sentences of altogether heterogenous worlds of thought. In such a way also Aristotle and Christianity might well be joined.⁵ At the time of the successors of the great Scholastics, the disinte-

⁵“Die Gedankenwelten erscheinen dort ((im Mittelalter) nicht als lebendige Einheiten, deren eigentuemlicher Geist in alle Verzweigungen hinabreicht, sondern sie sind aufgeloeset in ein Nebeneinander einzelner Saetze, die sich ganz wohl so oder so ordnen, zusammenfuegen, mit Saetzen aus heterogenen Gedankenwelten vereinbaren lassen. In dieser Weise sind auch Aristoteles und das Christentum ganz wohl vereinbar zusammenzubringen.” (Thomas von Aquin und Kant, ein Kampf zweier Welten, p. 39) in M. Grabmann, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

gration of the incompatible elements, faith and reason, dogma and Aristotle, had set in.⁶ Scholastic philosophy was already in the process of decomposition from within itself when the forces of the new *Zeitgeist* broke in to demolish it.⁷ The representatives of the new *Zeitgeist* were consistent when they emphatically and disdainfully repudiated all that savored of speculation on the basis of the theocentric and transcendental conception. Thus, according to rationalist historians, the downfall of Scholasticism was brought about by its own contradictory character, by the immanentistic, anthropocentric, and naturalistic bent of the new movements, and by the war of their representatives on Scholasticism.

Does this interpretation stand the test of historical criticism?

Though it is true that much still remains to be written about the causes, the different stages, and the significance of the decline of Scholasticism, yet

valuable data for such work have been already collected; and these point to the conclusion that the decline in question must not be regarded as the *death agony of a philosophical system*, killed by modern discoveries, but rather as a very complex intellectual movement laden with many injurious influences *quite other than the philosophical doctrine itself*. An impartial study of these factors would go to show that

⁶Cf. the view of August Sabatier: "With the revival of the sciences under the action of Scotus Eriugena and Anselm of Canterbury, dogma had organized itself to a logical system; it also had made the bold attempt to prove its reasonability, and had become, in the *Summa* of St. Thomas Aquinas, a magnificent philosophical system covering the whole field of human knowledge and concluding human thought in final solutions. However, Nominalism which, under Duns Scotus and Ockam, won the upper hand brought forward the ever more irremediable contradiction between the dogma of the Church and natural reason. The attempt of Scholasticism failed because it involved a contradiction. If dogma could be proven as a rational truth, the authority of the Church became superfluous, and its place was taken by the authority of reason; if, however, it was to be irrational, then, in opposition to it, a restless war broke out between tradition appealing to ecclesiastical authority and reason emancipated. It is known what happened. Modern reason won the power over the minds and therewith the crisis of dogma began." *Religionsphilosophie auf psychologischer Grundlage, uebersetzt von August Baur, Freiburg 1898*, p. 255 ff. quoted by Martin Grabmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 15-16.

⁷H. Ritter, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, VIII, p. 698, in Otto Willmann, *op. cit.*, p. 545.

the sterility of the period in question is to be laid at the door of the philosophers rather than of the philosophy.⁸

A look at the following centuries lends strength to this conclusion. The history of philosophy knows of a

real and profound revival in Spain and Portugal during the sixteenth century, a return to the great leading principles of Scholasticism, an intellectual awakening which bears eloquent testimony to the vitality of its doctrines in the hands of really capable men as distinct from petty, unenlightened quibblers.⁹

The great revival during the second half of the nineteenth century and its consequent development, which will be presented in the following chapter, is an even more eloquent testimony. Hence contrary to the views of prejudiced¹⁰ rationalist historians it must be maintained that there never was a complete interruption of Scholastic tradition down through the centuries up to the neo-Scholastic revival about the middle of the last century.

Ever and anon we see great names arise above the level of an almost universal mediocrity, to form occasional brilliant links in the long chain that connects the sixteenth with the twentieth century.¹¹

Precisely on the basis of improved and intensified historical studies neo-Scholastics, and Catholic authors in general, deny that there was an "end of Scholasticism" either by a so-called "self-dissolution," "self-destruction" or an "annihilation by

⁸M. De Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New* (Dublin: M. H. Gill and Son, Ltd., 1907), p. 145.

⁹*Ibid.*, p. 146.

¹⁰Martin Grabmann writes: "Die Verschiedenheit der ueber die Scholastik bestehenden Auffassungen ruehrt zu einem guten Teile davon her, dass man, statt auf dem Wege muehsamer Quellenstudien und sorgsamster Quellenkritik sich ueber die Einzelheiten der Scholastik genau zu unterrichten und erst auf Grund genauester Einzelerkenntnisse zu einem allgemeinen Urteil fortzuschreiten, sich mit Hilfe sekundaerer und tertiarer Darstellungen ein Bild vom Werden, Wesen und Wert der Scholastik konstruiert und so Richtungen, Entwicklungen und Zusammenhaenge in das mittelalterliche Denken hineintraegt, die niemals wirklich waren." *Die Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, I, p. 38.

¹¹M. De Wulf, *op. cit.*, p. 146.

modern ideas.”¹² And as far as a decline is concerned, they agree that it

was attributable, not to some flaw in the system itself, but to causes quite extraneous, in fact contrary, to its essence and spirit; it was not the genuine Scholasticism of the thirteenth century that was put to the test and superseded, but a decadent semblance thereof; throughout the entire period the causes of decay left intact and sound the vital parts, the great organic doctrines of Scholastic philosophy.¹³

The antithesis between the traditional Scholastic point of view and that of the new movements is more alleged than real, because in point of principle the Scholastic metaphysics of being with its conception of God as source, conserver and ruler of all reality in no way is opposed to, or excludes the rights of man and nature. Rationalists claim that it was only the new movements with their anthropocentric and naturalistic view of the world which discovered the dignity and inherent worth of man and made him conscious of his rights and worth. Until then man, because unaware of his worth, was as nothing in his own eyes, and entirely at the mercy of Church and Empire. Lacking self-confidence, he lacked also individuality. He

knew no other nobility but that of his origin, no other mission but that of preparing for the future by fasting and penance. Now, in the intense realization of present joy and beauty, man is everything: no longer a slave, but master; no longer a member, but the head; no longer a scholar, doctor, baron, Guelph, Ghibelline, Christian, — he is himself, man. He had made himself: ‘I have made myself,’ said Pontano. He is his own end: ‘man made for himself,’ said Latini.¹⁴

But an objective look into history shows that it was not only then that the discovery of man was made. The apologists

¹²Cf. Otto Willmann, *op. cit.*, p. 545. Jos. Kleutgen, *op. cit.*, p. 313. Albert Stoeckl, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (Mainz: Kirchheim & Co., 1924), p. 221.

¹³Zybura, p. 464.

¹⁴Monnier, quoted by J. S. Zybura, pp. 380-81.

of early Christianity and the Fathers of the Church¹⁵ by repelling the pagan attacks on Christendom as antagonistic to the rights of man and nature and worldly joy and the free development of individual and social activities, give clear expression of their positive valuation of man and nature. They recognize and defend the individual worth even of the slave; they stress the duty and dignity of labor, making the individual responsible in conscience for each human act; they know of sanctification of human acts and see in man the image and likeness of God. Belittling man and despising nature is foreign to the early Christian and later Scholastic conception of man and nature; on the contrary, nature and man in particular are revelations of the infinitely perfect and personal God. Man is endowed with a spiritual soul, coming directly from the creative hands of God and destined for immortality in bliss with the eternal personal God. The least of human beings is a person, and is defended against being treated as a mere thing.

It was in the philosophy cultivated by the Fathers of the Church and later on by the Scholastics that true and genuine humanism found true understanding, full appreciation, and concrete application. Even men who otherwise find enough faults with Scholasticism admit that "the Scholastic philoso-

¹⁵Ludwig Pastor, in his introduction to the first volume of his "*Geschichte der Päpste*," points out: "In keeping with the principle that science is a great good, that its abuse does not justify its suppression, the Church, striking in this matter, as in all other things, the right mean has from the beginning combated only the pagan superstition, the pagan immorality, but not the Greek and Roman intellectual culture. After the example of the great Apostle of the Gentiles, to whom the Greek poets and philosophers were no strangers, the majority of the men who continued his work held in high esteem and recommended classical studies. Even the first Christians who were known for their austerity found no objection to dressing ideas of their religion in verses of pagan poets, e.g., Vergil's. When Emperor Julian attempted to deprive the Christians of the classical studies as an important means of education, the wisest representatives of the Church saw therein one of the measures most hostile and dangerous to Christendom." The Fathers of the Church were ever quick to appreciate and eager to appropriate whatever was true, good and beautiful in classical antiquity; however, they were careful to avoid the moral and religious dangers lurking in classical literature. After quoting a number of Fathers, Pastor concludes: "From thence on by tradition the harmonious union of classical culture with Christian education was considered in the Church a certain necessity, as, in general, the scientific development of the period to which most of the mentioned Fathers belong became important for all the times of the Church." *Geschichte der Päpste* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder & Co., 1931), I. pp. 9 and 12.

phers' knowledge of...the inner life, — of the soul, its nature, its aspirations, its needs, was profound. Here they were in close touch with experience. The philosophy they built on this foundation is correspondingly important."¹⁶ "Their works abound in excellent psychological analyses, and... the thorough objectivity of their ethical doctrine gives it the highest importance."¹⁷

Human nature and the problems to which it gives rise had been studied by St. Augustine, St. Thomas, and many others with a precision and minuteness by no means less than those which were brought to bear upon them by the writers of the Renaissance.¹⁸

Hence they regard the great truths founded on universal consent as the gifts of nature, look upon common sense as the natural regulative principle of philosophy, and on natural law — the unwritten law of the ancient, — as an imprint of the eternal law, of divine wisdom, on the human soul. Hence, also in determining the fundamental principles of ethics, they consult and take as guides the essential tendencies of human nature. The animate and inanimate nature outside of man likewise comes from God, and is a revelation of His power, wisdom and beauty. Nothing whatever debars us from studying, interpreting, and subjecting it with a view to availing ourselves of whatever in it conduces to our advancement in harmony with the will of God.¹⁹

There is, however, a great difference between the Scholastic valuation of man and nature and that of the new movements. According to the Scholastic theocentric conception of reality, God is the source and final goal of all reality, its Supreme Lord, the only real Absolute. Whatever is not God, is finite and relative, essentially and substantially different from Him. All beings besides God constitute a hierarchically ordered whole, the kosmos, in which each being occupies a position according

¹⁶Professor Charles M. Bakewell, in John S. Zybur, *op. cit.*, p. 17.

¹⁷Professor A. E. Taylor, in Zybur, p. 69.

¹⁸A. Baudrillart, *The Catholic Church, the Renaissance and the Reformation* (London, 1908) p. 14, in John S. Zybur, *op. cit.*, pp. 406-407.

¹⁹Zybur, *op. cit.*, p. 408.

to the degree of its perfection, that is, its share in being. Endowed with its own essence and individuality, its nature and power to act according to this nature, every being is related to any other within this kosmos, and related to God, the *Ens Supremum*. The worth and importance of every being are measured by its hierarchical position and cosmical function. Scholasticism is filled with reverence for every, even the lowest, being as a participation in the Primary Being, and because contempt for any being would redound in contempt of the source and author of this being. Man is placed by Scholasticism on top of the hierarchy of the visible world. Composed of body and soul he is by his animality related to all orders below him, but by his personality is superior to them. This personality, implying spiritual knowledge and freedom sets him in a peculiar relation to the personal God Whose likeness and image he is.

Scarcely has a philosopher devoted more interest to the study of man, pointed out in a more exalting way his dignity and worth, and shown a greater reverence for him, for *humanitas*, than St. Thomas has done in his *Summa*. The statement, therefore, that only Humanism discovered man, betrays a regrettable ignorance of the earlier thinkers and their thoughts about man.

In spite of his top position in the visible universe man remains for Scholastic philosophy a creature; hence he is not autonomous, but dependent on and subordinated to the *Ens Primum* and *a se*, not an end in himself but related to the ultimate goal. This ordination of man to God as his ultimate goal properly dignifies and glorifies man, while the "deification" of man by neo-pagan Humanism, strictly speaking, degrades man by depriving him of any ennobling relation to a higher being while letting loose the reins of his limited and actually deficient nature.²⁰

For the Scholastic conception there is no irreconcilable antithesis between transcendence and immanence, rather its

²⁰See: Theodor Steinbuechel, *Die philosophische Grundlegung der Katholischen Sittenlehre* (Düsseldorf: Patmos-Verlag, 1951), pp. 32-60 (Der Inhalt der christlichen Humanitas).

moderation strikes the golden mean in a synthesis of transcendence and immanence which saves it from the errors of Deism and Pantheism, Naturalism and Supranaturalism. God really exists and is neither a stranger to this world nor confused with this world; and man is neither extolled beyond his actual worth nor deprived of his real and proper prerogatives.

Besides, as far as the question of fact is concerned, the influence of the new *Zeitgeist* was not so sweeping and all-embracing as the rationalists claim it was. Pastor warns:

One must bear in mind that in this movement which started in the realm of literature two opposed currents were conflicting with each other from the beginning. These two currents were already more or less clearly discernible in the ingenious men who must be considered the true founders of the literature of the Renaissance: Petrarch and Boccaccio,²¹

and became more pronouncedly opposed with the progress of the movement.

On the one side the banner of heathen culture was raised in an exaggerated, morbid enthusiasm for classical ideals; its followers advocated in many of their writings a pronouncedly pagan world view (*Weltanschauung*). On the other side they strove to bring the antique element into harmony with the Christian element, and render the intellectual treasures of antiquity, a valuable increment of new ideas and stimulants, fruitful for the development and deepening of the existing culture. The true Christian tendency was opposed by the false, pagan one. Real intellectual progress could be hoped for only from the former which, free from all exaggerated fanaticism, preserved a sufficiently sound judgment to perceive that not a breach with the approved principles of Christianity and the development of more than a thousand years, but only a reconciliation be-

²¹“...muss man sich vor allem gegenwärtig halten, dass von Anfang an innerhalb der Bewegung der Renaissance, die zunächst auf dem Gebiete der Literatur sich geltend machte, zwei entgegengesetzte Stroemungen miteinander rangen. Mehr oder minder deutlich erkennbar sind diese beiden Stroemungen bereits bei den genialen Maennern, die als die eigentlichen Begründer der Renaissanceliteratur betrachtet werden muessen: bei Petrarca and Boccaccio.” *Geschichte der Paepste*, I, p. 1.

tween the actually existing tendencies could prove a blessing for mankind. The world owes it to the adherents of this tendency that the Renaissance was saved from bringing about its own destruction. Not a few humanists wavered between these two streams, some sought to find a happy mean, others were in their youth carried away by one current, in mature age by the other.²²

The more judicious and mature humanists saw that the beauty of classic form could become the appropriate artistic vesture of the thoughts of Christian tradition which always appreciated the good and true content of classic culture. In class, they explained the classics in the spirit of the Fathers: the ethical and religious truths which were found in the pagan writers were affectionately pointed out, and attention was called to the fact that they were but faint traces of the primitive revelation. It should here be remembered that a number of Popes and ecclesiastical dignitaries themselves enthusiastically welcomed Humanism and introduced it into the ecclesiastical sphere with a view to harmonizing the content of ancient philosophy with Christian thought, combining Scholastic culture with the Humanist sense for form.²³ Pastor observes:

The standpoint of the Christian Humanists in relation to the ancient world was the only true one;

²²“Auf der einen Seite erhob man in uebertriebener, krankhafter Schwaermerei fuer die klassischen Ideale das Banner der heidnischen Kultur; die Anhaenger dieser Richtung vertraten in vielen ihrer Schriften eine vorwiegend heidnische Weltanschauung. Auf der andern Seite rang man danach, das antike Element mit dem christlichen harmonisch zu vereinigen und die Geisteschaetze des Altertums als wertvollen Zuwachs neuer Gedanken und Anregungen fuer die Weiterbildung und Vertiefung der vorhandenen Kultur fruchtbar zu machen; der falschen, heidnischen Richtung stand die wahre, christliche Richtung gegenueber.

Wirklicher geistiger Fortschritt war nur von der letzteren Richtung zu hoffen, die, entfernt von aller uebertriebenen Schwaermerei, sich gesundes Urtheil genug bewahrte, um einzusehen, dass nicht ein Bruch mit den bewahrten Grundsuetzen des Christentums und einer mehr als tausendjaehrigen Entwicklung sondern allein ein Ausgleich und eine Versoehnng mit dem einmal Vorhandenen der Menschheit zum Segen gereichen werde. Dass die Renaissance sich nicht voellig selbst vernichtete, verdankt die Welt den Vertretern dieser Richtung.

Nicht wenige Humanisten schwankten zwischen beiden Richtungen hin und her, andere suchten zu vermitteln, wieder andere wurden in der Jugend von der einen, im Alter von der andern Stroemung erfasst.” *Loc. cit.*, pp. 14-16.

²³For details see Ludwig Pastor, *op. cit.*, pp. 59 ff.

they have more or less solved the problem of a just appreciation of antiquity. Their enthusiasm for the antique intellectual treasures never was so immoderate as to endanger the intimate devotion to Christendom. Contrary to the idolizers of antiquity they held fast to the principles concerning the reading of the pagan writers that the content was to be judged and measured by the principles of Christianity. They perceived the danger of so idolizing the moral and religious principles of heathenism as if a doctrine, a moral uplifting, remission of sin, and grace from on high had not been necessary, and as if the highest end of life could be achieved by means of the heathen principles alone.

Only in the light of Christianity can the ancient world be truly, completely, and fully estimated; for the ideal of humanity as conceived by classic heathenism and exhibited in its heroes and divinities is neither the full nor the complete ideal of humanity. It is but a shadowy outline, expecting color and life from a higher ideal, a fragment the deficiencies of which look for complement in a more perfect whole.²⁴

Hence from the standpoint of principle as well as of historic fact the alleged interruption or end of Scholasticism through self-dissolution or demolition by new ideas or discoveries or the new *Zeitgeist* cannot be upheld. As Grabmann²⁵ well pointed out, the variety of opinions on Scholasticism is a product of

²⁴"Der Standpunkt der christlichen Humanisten gegenueber der alten Welt war der allein richtige; sie haben mehr oder minder das Problem einer gerechten Wuerdigung des Altertums geloest. Ihre Begeisterung fuer die antiken Geistesschaetze war nicht so masslos, das durch sie die innige Liebe zum Christentum gefaehrdet wurde. Im Gegensatz zu den Vergoetterern des Altertums hielten sie als Richtschnur fest, dass bei Lesung der heidnischen Schriftsteller der Inhalt nach den Grundsuetzen des Christentums beurteilt und bemessen werden muesse. Sie erkannten, welch grosse Gefahr darin liegt, wenn die sittlichen und religioesen Grundsuetze des Heidentums so idealisiert werden, als sei eine Belehrung, eine sittliche Hebung, eine Schuldtilgung und Begnadigung von oben nicht noetig gewesen, als koennte durch jene heidnischen Grundsuetze der hoechste Lebenszweck erreicht werden.

Nur im Lichte des Christentums kann die antike Welt richtig, ganz und voll gewuerdigt werden; denn 'das Ideal der Menschlichkeit, welches das klassische Heidentum erfasste und welches es in seinen Heroen und Goetterbildern darstellte, ist weder das volle noch das ganze Ideal der Menschlichkeit. Es ist nur ein Schattenriss, welcher seine Farbe und sein Leben von einem hoeheren Bilde erwartet, und ein Bruchstueck, dessen Luecken in einem hoeheren Ganzen ihre Vollendung suchen.'" *Loc. cit.*, pp. 54-55.

²⁵See note 10.

prejudice. Based as they are on secondary or third sources only, they are misconstructions, presentations of Scholasticism as it never existed.

Since, however, it is generally admitted that the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries were a period of decadence, the question must be asked again: In what did this decadence consist and how far did it affect the Scholastic system? In answer, it must be stated that the decadence did not affect the substance of Scholastic philosophy. A philosophical system may be said to decay intrinsically only when its truth-content gradually is given up and replaced by false tenets. "Throughout the entire period," however, "the causes of decay left intact and sound the vital parts, the great organic doctrines of Scholastic philosophy." The members of the major Scholastic schools of the transition period always held fast to the principles of the great masters of the thirteenth century.

But they were not men of the caliber of the Golden Age Scholastics, those intellectual giants of marked originality who, by combining a sense of deep appreciation of the work already done with an extraordinary talent for progressive and constructive speculation, brought about such achievements as "the immortal synthesis of all preceding thought" of St. Thomas. The great masters searched all available material and utilized it to the farthest possible extent, correcting and enlarging on it, developing and adding, and thus constructing a comprehensive synthesis. In the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, progressively constructive thinking was arrested, philosophic activity exhausted itself mainly in preserving and transmitting the heritage from the glorious past. New ideas were wanting, the doctrines of the Golden Age were merely reproduced. Although there were numerically many more students of philosophy, the development of philosophy did not progress. M. de Wulf reports that, according to the *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*,²⁶ the number of those who devoted their attention to philosophy increased tremendously. The study of philosophy was facilitated by the great increase in the number of universities.

²⁶M. De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy* (London: Longmans, Green and Co., Ltd., 1926), II, p. 168.

But the majority of those with an interest in philosophy, gave their allegiance to one of the existing schools, viz., the three great schools of Thomists or Realists,²⁷ Scotists or Formalists, and Nominalists or Terminists.²⁸ They believed they had done their part by following strictly the ideas of their respective school and defending them against other schools. As a result of this, authority was given undue weight, contrary to the principle stated by St. Thomas that the argument from authority is the weakest.²⁹ "As schools increased in number, so individual thought became more rare." The formation of distinct schools fostered the spirit of partisanship which directed the intellectual energy from profound original investigation and constructive effort to controversy — a process leading to stagnation. Only if regarded according to the old saying that "standing still means going back" may the arrest of constructive development be said to be a decadence.³⁰

The decline shows itself especially in the form, i.e., in method and language. The Scholastic manner of expounding a question, modeled on that of Aristotle and rounded out in the thirteenth century, so successfully used by the great masters, was abused in vexing exaggeration.³¹ Questions were drawn out through an endless series of pro's and con's and lengthy refutations of opposing views, requiring more than ordinary effort and interest to follow the long-winded question without losing the thread. In this way logic, looked upon by the Scholasticism of the thirteenth century as a mental discipline to prepare the way for other philosophical studies, fell a prey to the danger

²⁷A. Stoeckl, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (Mainz: Kirchheim & Co., 1924), p. 221.

²⁸On the controversy between De Wulf and M. Baumgartner concerning the application of these two names, see F. Ehrle, *Die Scholastik und ihre Aufgaben in unserer Zeit* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder & Co., 1933), pp. 20-21.

²⁹*S. Th.*, I, q. 1, a. 8, ad 2.: "locus ab auctoritate quae fundatur super ratione humana, . . . infirmissimus;"

³⁰Cf. Fed. Klimke, *Historia de la Filosofia* (Barcelona: Editorial Labor, S. A., 1947), p. 289.

³¹M. De Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New*, p. 147: "There were vexations and inexcusable faults of method: the endless multiplication of distinctions and sub-distinctions and divisions and classifications, on the plea of clearness; until finally all thought became mystified and muddled in an inextricable maze of schemes, systems and departments! Nothing could have been better calculated to foment those abuses than the dialectic formalism that poisoned all the philosophical writings of the sixteenth century."

of becoming a purpose in itself instead of being a means, an *organon*, as defined by Aristotle. Questions of pure dialectics were put in the forefront and became the fashion. Essential matters were neglected while trifles and subtleties were hotly discussed;³² and in the treatment of these questions acuteness degenerated into hairsplitting, the polite and objective tone of the great Scholastics in controversial matters changed to bitter aggressiveness with personal allusions and strong expressions.³³

To the abuse of method was added the decadence of language. De Wulf quotes a passage from Charles Binder, an author of the early seventeenth century, who defines a Scholastic as a man who spends the greater part of his life in commenting upon Aristotle and the barbarous commentaries of Albert, Thomas, Holcot, Pricot, Mammatreductus, Maffretus, and other obscure persons, concerning whom one might sometimes wonder whether they are using Latin or the language of the Scythians.³⁴ Although Binder mentions Albert and St. Thomas, the Scholastics, as De Wulf remarks, are for him, as also for Tribbechovius, especially the Terminists, Scotists and Thomists of the end of the Middle Ages, hence all later than the thirteenth century. One should not forget that the humanists, fascinated by classical antiquity as they were, well-nigh idolized their cult of literary elegance and style, and therefore certainly exaggerated their criticism of and contempt for the style of the end of the Middle Ages. Still it remains true that the fluent and pleasant, clear and easy mode of expression of the earlier Middle Ages more and more began to disappear. The language became increasingly uncouth and unadorned, barbarisms, lack of accuracy, neg-

³²M. De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, I, p. 7, quotes Tribbechovius, *De doctoribus scholasticis et corrupta per eos divinarum humanarumque rerum scientia*, Giessae, 1665 and Jena 1719, p. 37: "Scholastici omne punctum tum demum se tulisse arbitrantur, si quando tribus syllogismis instructi de quavis materia litem movere possent."

³³*Ibid.*, II, p. 168.

³⁴*Ibid.*, I, p. 2 note 3: "Ab eo tempore nullus fuit ad scholasticam professionem admissus... qui non maximam aetatis suae partem tribuisset in Aristotelis litteris, et post hunc in barbaris commentariis super Aristotelem, Alberti, Thomae, Holcot, Pricot, Mammatreductus, Maffreti et aliorum tenebriorum de quibus interdum dubites an Scythe vel latine loquantur." — *Scholastica Theologia, in qua disseritur de eius causis, origine, progressu ac methodo legendi scholasticos. auctore Christ. Bindero*, Tubing (sic) 1614, (p. 15). On page 7, note 3 from Tribbechovius, *op. cit.*, p. 37: "Qui litterarum regnum media in barbarie tenuerut Scholastici."

lect of orthography became more frequent and these were precisely the factors that primarily were apt to discredit before the elegant but shallow humanists that philosophy which was presented in so poor a dress.

Now, which were the causes that brought about this state of decline of Scholastic philosophy?

Among the intrinsic causes were:

1) The lack of men of genius, of great original thinkers endowed both with the true philosophic and scientific temper. Speculation, in order to be sound and fruitful, constructive and objective, i.e., grounded on reality, needs a sufficiently broad experimental substructure supplying the necessary data to start with. After the comprehensive philosophical elaboration by the great masters of the available material from experience and contemporary positive science, there was the need for positive knowledge from sources by methods for which the men of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries do not seem to have had the necessary sense and interest, while the men of the following centuries failed to have the desirable contact with the scientific movement of their time and to accept the new data furnished by the scientific advance.

2) The re-appearance of Nominalism. A decidedly negative influence on the destinies of Scholasticism at that time came from the revival of Nominalism with its vehement reaction against Thomistic and Scotistic Realism, which Ueberweg-Geyer consider the most important event for the philosophy of the fourteenth century in general.³⁵ According to Fr. Ehrle,³⁶ Nominalism stands for more than a theory in the problem of the universals only. True, its name was derived from its solution of this problem, but its influence reached far beyond the limits of the problem of the universals. It embodied the *Zeitgeist* of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries, which found entrance into almost all orders and schools and impressed its seal on their work. Its nature manifested itself in an unbridled desire

³⁵Friedrich Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1951), II, p. 571.

³⁶Fr. Ehrle, *Die Scholastik und ihre Aufgaben in unserer Zeit* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder & Co., 1933), pp. 20-23.

for novelty, love of subtleties, and search for the bizarre together with a strong inclination for purely sceptic and destructive criticism. The fomentation of the passionate quarrels between the different schools which diverted the philosophical interest from investigation and thorough study, must be laid at the door of Nominalism. Its antagonistic spirit seems typified in the bitter personal opposition of its founder to the highest ecclesiastical authority.

The philosophy of William of Ockam had the success of a novelty and a reaction. It naturally appealed to doubting minds, and to all those who liked to find reason in default in presence of certain dogmas. It represented a new method, that of subtleties and dialectical *finesse*. It welcomed witticisms, tolerated irony, and allowed a common and even trivial phraseology — all liberties which rendered discussion more lively and attractive to young minds. Mental gymnastics became a kind of sport which the disciples of the *venerabilis inceptor* practised with more virtuosity than the master himself.³⁷

Fourteenth century Nominalism arose out of a reaction against the formalism of Duns Scotus and the exaggerations of his disciples, but it turned out to be more excessive itself. In the problem of the universals it opposed the moderate realism of the Thomists and denied to universal concepts any reality whatsoever in the things themselves. Subtle and sceptic criticism of all arguments, demanding almost everywhere mathematical evidence, contested their demonstrative value, and thus shook the whole edifice of Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy of nature, psychology, and natural theology. Emphasis on the weakness of reason begot an unwarranted distrust of its powers. The range of truths demonstrable by reason was narrowed down, that of truths of pure faith correspondingly enlarged. Such truths as the substantial unity of body and soul, the simplicity and immortality of the soul were stated to be indemonstrable by reason. Even the demonstrative validity of the arguments for the existence of God, His unicity and Infinity, was disputed. This

³⁷De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, II, pp. 186-87.

destructive criticism created a disposition of mind which favored scepticism and was exploited by subsequent generations that "were increasingly disposed to hold that everything in scholasticism was unsound."³⁸ In the field of Ethics a form of voluntarism gained strength which would derive moral good and evil exclusively from the will of God. Theology's fundamental function, to derive and prove the content of faith from the sources of Revelation and Tradition, was relegated to the background and greatly neglected while a purely logical-terminist speculation prevailed. In the words of Fr. Ehrle, "Theology became the playground of logic." Characteristic of this whole tendency was the fact that in most of the commentaries on the *Libri Sententiarum* the explanation of the first book which offers the best opportunity for dialectical and metaphysical subtleties was favored to such an extent that the other books remained far behind.

The conceptualist terminism and the impoverishment of metaphysics are the most significant elements in Ockam. The wide scope given to logic, *scientia rationalis*, and the impotency of reason are but consequences of his epistemological position. Ockam's system threatened not only Scotism and Thomism but for the first time shook the whole edifice of Scholasticism. He maintained the objectivity of intuitive knowledge, the distinctions between sensation and thought, matter and form, substance and accident, act and potency, and in fact the general scheme of reality constructed in the thirteenth century. But he showed by what methods these could be attacked, and called forth the spirit of agnosticism.³⁹

The Nominalist tendency, foreshadowed in the critical-sceptical and dialectical inclination of Duns Scotus, was initiated by Petrus Aureoli and Durandus of St. Pourcain, the former having deserted from the Scotist and the latter from the Thomist camp, Henry of Harelay and William of Alnwick, and

³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 171.

³⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 185-86.

elaborated by William of Ockam⁴⁰ to whom it owes its extraordinary success.

That the Nominalist tendency really was something like a *Zeitgeist* can be seen from its wide diffusion to all the universities of the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries⁴¹ and from the obstinacy with which it held its ground in spite of all attempts at reform.⁴²

It must be laid to the credit of Nominalism that its criticism discovered weak points in the traditional arguments, raised justified doubts and problems which occasioned a closer examination of some questions. The emphasis on the individual as against the universal and the cultivation of mathematics and experiment shifted the attention to inductive research and prepared the way for the modern sciences.⁴³ P. Duhem is usually credited with having shown that the forerunners of modern science are found in the Nominalist group.⁴⁴

3) The growing ignorance of the real meaning and character of the Scholastic system led to misconceptions, false explanations and wrong applications of Scholastic concepts and terms.

They still, no doubt, talked and wrote of matter and form in the scholastic manuals of the seventeenth century, but they commonly compared the union of those two principles with that of a man and woman who would meet and marry, and then get divorced in order to contract other matrimonial alliances.

When Malebranche and Arnauld ridiculed the "*species intentionales*", their scoffs and sarcasms were justified by the fantastic notions of those scholastics who had inherited only a deformed caricature of the ideology of the thirteenth century.

When Molière concocted his quodlibets against the theory of faculties, or made fun of the "*virtus*

⁴⁰Ueberweg, *op. cit.*, pp. 572 ff.

⁴¹De Wulf, *op. cit.*, pp. 186-89; 203-05.

⁴²Fr. Ehrle, *op. cit.*, p. 23.

⁴³Ibid., p. 24. Ueberweg, *op. cit.*, pp. 595-602; Klimke, *op. cit.*, p. 294.

⁴⁴De Wulf, *op. cit.*, 171; Fr. Ehrle, *loc. cit.*, note 1; Martin Grabmann, *Nature and Problems of the New Scholasticism in the Light of History*, in Zybura, *op. cit.*, p. 131.

dormitiva" of opium, his bantering sallies were not undeserved; for many of his contemporaries who stood by those scholastic formulae, either gave them a merely verbal meaning, or mistook their real meaning betraying equally in both cases the sane and rational metaphysics of the thirteenth century which they thought they were defending.⁴⁵

4) The relaxation of the spirit of serious study which went along with the decline of the University of Paris. "Scholasticism, which had taken part in its development, suffered with its decline."⁴⁶ Up to the middle of the fourteenth century the University of Paris was an international center of intellectual activity. It had become "the metropolis of theology and philosophy in the West, a nursery of theologians and philosophers who came together from all countries and spread out everywhere from Paris".⁴⁷ It lost this cosmopolitan character and became a national university when, with the beginning of the fourteenth century, universities began to multiply.

Already during the first half of the thirteenth century *studia generalia* had been created at Padua, Naples and Salamanca. During the fourteenth century universities came into existence everywhere in German speaking countries: at Prague, Vienna, Cologne, Heidelberg, Erfurt, Greifswald, Leipzig, Rostock, Fribourg, Basle, Ingolstadt, Tuebingen, Wittenberg; similarly in Poland, Belgium; in France additional centers of study were instituted at Dol, Poitiers, Caen, Bordeaux.⁴⁸

With the existence of so many more universities the stream of foreign students going to Paris diminished very noticeably. Besides, famous masters departed from Paris and attached themselves to other universities to which they naturally transferred also the benefit of their fame.

While in the thirteenth century the Universities of Paris, Oxford, and Cambridge had the exclusive right to confer the mastership in theology — the most coveted degree in the Mid-

⁴⁵M. De Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New*, pp. 147-48. Willmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 595 ff.

⁴⁶M. De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, II, p. 165.

⁴⁷*Ibid.*, I, p. 261.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, p. 163.

dle Ages⁴⁹ — now also the other universities obtained or usurped the power to confer degrees in theology.

The decline of spirit in the University of Paris manifested itself in the following way:

The faculty of theology became the seat of intrigues and made light of regulations. By means of recommendations, or even in return for money, the “actus scholastici” were facilitated, the years of study shortened, and examinations made a mere matter of form. Students and graduates increased in number, but many were attracted by the prospects of obtaining ecclesiastical benefices. The faculty of arts displayed a similar laxity. Scholastic exercises were shortened, and ignorant beardless youths were allowed to occupy the chair. “Categorias, perihemeneias, in cuius scriptura summus Aristoteles calamum in corde tinxisse confingitur, infantili balbutie resonant impuberes et impoberbes.”⁵⁰

What can be observed in our own days was also in practice at that time: institutions in order to attract more students facilitated the requirements for promotion to degrees, to the detriment of the sciences themselves. Experience shows that opening the doors of the higher courses to larger masses naturally results in lowering the quality of the products. “En una palabra: cuantas mas escuelas habia, cuantos mas eran los que se ocupaban en los estudios filosoficos, tanto menos profundos eran estos estudios.”⁵¹

When the diminishing earnestness of study and the deteriorating disposition of the student body called for a better teaching force, the commentators on the official textbook in theology treated the text with greater freedom, introducing new and difficult questions, using a complicated terminology.

⁴⁹M. De Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New*, p. 58; “Everyone’s ambition, after studying or while continuing to study philosophy, was to become a theologian. Later on, in the universities, degrees in arts were a necessary qualification for degrees in theology. To be a bachelor, licentiate, or master in theology, was the end; to study philosophy, the means — . . .”

⁵⁰M. De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, II, p. 162 — The Latin quotation by Wulf from Ricardus de Bury, *Philobiblon*, 1344, c. ix, p. 87 (1888 edition), quoted in *Chartularium*, II, p. viii.

⁵¹Klimke, p. 289.

and substituting subtleties for clearness and thoroughness. Exaggerated dialectical exercises indicated the progress of sophistry so much favored by Nominalism.⁵²

External forces attempted to interfere with the policies of the university authorities: "Princes, kings, and Parliaments intervened to forbid or impose some particular position in philosophy."⁵³ The universities themselves, the new universities by their foundation statutes, the old ones by new decrees, took steps to impose either Ockamism, or Scotistic or Thomist realism, measures which were not favorable to a free development of philosophic thought. Such measures gave rise to quarrels and factions among the faculties of one and the same university.

5) The antagonism of non-Scholastic tendencies. Due to the aforementioned causes Scholastic philosophy lost more and more of its influence and the honor in which it had been held. At the same time rival systems arose or grew stronger, disseminating doctrines antagonistic to those of Scholasticism. Latin Averroism, a great old rival of Scholasticism, in spite of prohibitions on the part of authorities and joint opposition by Scholastics of all parties, expanded anew at the beginning of the fourteenth century. John of Jandun, the recognized leader of Parisian Averroism, calling himself the ape of Aristotle and Averroes,⁵⁴ did all in his power to lessen the reputation of St. Thomas in the University of Paris, contemptuously belittling his commentaries on Aristotle.⁵⁵ His emphasis on the theory of the two truths undermined an important and far-reaching Scholastic principle. Human liberty and with it the whole Scholastic ethics was weakened by the Divine determinism, which Thomas Bradwardine, in dependence on William of

⁵²De Wulf *op. cit.*, pp. 189 ff.

⁵³Ueberweg, *op. cit.*, p. 611 and De Wulf, *op. cit.*, p. 215; both based on Fr. Ehrle, *Der Sentenzenkommentar Peters von Candia*, Muenster, 1925. — In 1245 the German Prince-Electors directed a complaint to the city of Cologne that realism had obtained exclusive hold of its university and thereby endangered the faith, because this old realism led to heresy, as was discovered at Prague, where John Huss taught his doctrine. — Cologne was always a stronghold of realism — the *via antiqua* — with a predominance of Thomism.

⁵⁴Ueberweg, *op. cit.*, p. 615; De Wulf, *op. cit.*, p. 232.

⁵⁵De Wulf, *op. cit.*, pp. 231 ff.

Ockam, inaugurated. Disciples of the Ockamist school extended their master's doctrines in the line of phenomenism and subjectivism. They taught that knowledge is merely a sign of the things which attains to the sign only, not to the thing signified; the abstract concept of cause has no connection with reality; the application of the logico-grammatical method leads to paradoxical theories, in theology to the ruin or at least ridicule of all dogma.

Exaggerated Ockamism became allied to the Divine Determinism of Bradwardine, which it inspired, and which in return provided it with doctrinal elements. It also freely embraced incoherent theories the very strangeness of which constituted an unhealthy attraction, and which seem to have been accepted simply for the pleasure of giving scandal.⁵⁶

These anti-Scholastic theories "helped to create an atmosphere of scepticism, and an ever-increasing mistrust of the Scholastic systematization hitherto held in honor."

B. The corrosive work of these intrinsic causes was favored by external causes. It occurred in a sad period of almost universal unrest and languor. Profound changes took place in Western civilization and began, from the dawn of the fourteenth century, to break up the powerful unitive organization of medieval civilization. The insurrection of the Germanic emperors and kings against the Papacy weakened the authority of the Pope, the clergy fell more and more in sympathy with worldliness, political and civil life suffered from terrible disorders.⁵⁷

At Rome on Christmas of the year eight hundred, Charlemagne was crowned emperor and thereby became protector of the Pope and the Church. The cornerstone of a new human society was laid, the cornerstone of the Occident which showed its greatness in the unity of Church and State, of the temporal and the spiritual power. What ultimately made the Occident great and strong was the determination and direction which the whole life, individual as well as social, received from the re-

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, p. 238.

⁵⁷Pastor, *op. cit.*, p. 14.

ligious, from God, from the intimate union with God. The Christian element which united all was stronger than all differences. The strength of this unity began to weaken with the development in the direction from God-nearness to God-remoteness, from intimacy with God to godlessness, from a theocentric to a geocentric attitude, in a word, with the development of what is called the process of secularization. The machinations of the German Kings to get power over the Church opened the way to a breach of the harmony between the spiritual and temporal power, to an estrangement of the one from the other, and soon to an opposition of the two powers which found its expression in the wars of the Germanic emperors against the Pope, especially of Henry IV against Gregory VII. Finally, during the fourteenth century, the separation became so formal that the temporal power was no more considered as derived from God according to Rm. 13, 1: "There exists no authority except from God," but as derived from the will of the people.⁵⁸ With this the unity of the Occident was facing the great danger of being split, because this meant a denial of the unity between the Kingdom of God and the kingdom of this world in the ideal sense, and both were set in opposition to each other. The idea of the City of God was abandoned and the State was conceived as a "worldly thing." The process of secularization manifesting itself herein is the basic cause of the modern development of the Occident, a process leading to the formation of the view that the State as well as all forms of community life are ultimately derived from the right and the arbitrary will of the individual, the fundamental conception of this view being that the nature of society must not be looked for in the unity of many but in the plurality of individuals. Not the unified and organized whole, but mass and plurality as such stand in the forefront. This is an individualistic conception of society which reached its full development only in modern times but had first appeared in the events of the Middle Ages. According to this conception it is only the individuals that are real; society and sociates are something accidental, artificial, not natural or origi-

⁵⁸De Wulf, *op. cit.*, pp. 220-230.

nal, essential. One of the last ideological roots of this modern individual is the philosophy of Nominalism, the philosophy that paved the way for that current of thought which identifies all realities with what is seizable by the senses.⁵⁹

The great empire came to the point of crumbling; the idea of a universal monarchy and its unitive powers was being replaced by the conception of individual nations with their own peculiar temperament; national sentiment awakened. "Europe took on a nationalist appearance." National differences deepened to national opposition leading to warfare. The Hundred Years' War was a conflict which divided, not quarreling princes or feuding families, but the French and English peoples and accentuated their national antipathies. The more the different nationalities were organized interiorly and the more exclusively they followed their peculiar tendencies, the more possibilities of friction arose.

Such a state of affairs, the rebellion and resistance of temporal rulers against the Pope, the hostilities among nations, had a hampering effect on studies, on the development of thought which needs a certain amount of ease and tranquillity in order to prosper.

The disorder of rebellion and wars was aggravated by the devastation of the Black Death which, about the middle of the fourteenth century, swept over Europe, reducing its population and weakening its vitality.

Furthermore, religious unity was exposed to a progressive weakening due to the Great Schism in the West. In the life of the Church there were deplorable disorders. Ecclesiastical discipline was being direly enervated; the worldly spirit and scandalous conduct of Churchmen in high positions, in patent contradiction to the principles of Scholastic metaphysics and ethics, robbed Scholastic philosophy of much of its honor and influence.

To preach and teach transcendence and other-worldliness, and at the same time to live as if this

⁵⁹Cf. A. Greck, "Mensch und Gesellschaft im Abendland," in, *Die Kirche in der Welt*, IV Jahrg. (1951), 1. Lfg., pp. 129-140.

world were "the be all and end all," could have but one result: to undermine and discredit a system of ideas that was so flagrantly belied in practice by many of its foremost representatives; and such mere lip-service was especially disastrous at a time when the tendency away from these basic doctrines of Scholastic metaphysics was so powerful and widespread.⁶⁰

A new sphere of interest, which absorbed a good deal of attention and mental energy, arose with the intensive development of commerce in different countries and brought about, through the creation of the Middle Class, the seat of wealth and influence, a perceptible change in the social order, which could not remain without consequences for the realm of science.

To sum it all up: Scholasticism did not cease to exist. While the Scholastic movement did not remain on the height of the thirteenth century, it was not owing to a weakness of the system itself, but to the men who were not equal to the system. If towards the end of the Middle Ages, says Willmann,⁶¹ different circles failed to understand and appreciate the Christian wisdom of Scholasticism, it does not follow that this wisdom itself failed. The successors of the great Christian masters did not possess the intellectual acumen of those masters; yet not the grand world of ideas burst and vanished, but a small generation turned its back on it. When an exaggerated Mysticism, when Monism and Nominalism appeared on the field of Scholasticism, they did not spring from Scholasticism. Even though they drew nourishment from it, they did so, not as branches draw from the stem and roots, but as parasites draw from the twigs.

⁶⁰Zybura, *op. cit.*, pp. 445-46.

⁶¹Willman, *op. cit.*, pp. 553-54.

CHAPTER III

THE REVIVAL OF SCHOLASTICISM

The decline of Scholasticism went on up to the beginning of the sixteenth century. Then, throughout the sixteenth century, a remarkable Scholastic revival took place, first in Spain and then successively in Portugal, Italy, Netherlands, France, and Germany. It was mainly due to the efforts and merits of the Dominican Order. Born in the convent of Saint-Jacques at Paris, it was carried over to the convent of San Esteban at Salamanca where it reached full development. The revival owes its origin to Peter Crockaert (1465-1514)¹ of Brussels, a former nominalist, who commented on the *Summa Theologica* in Paris in 1509. It was developed by Francis of Vittoria (1480-1546), a disciple of Crockaert, Dominic Soto (1494-1560), and Melchior Cano (1509-1560). In conscious opposition to the negligence of language and abuse of methods of the preceding period, Vittoria and Cano tried to attract their readers by a clear and pleasant mode of expression, and a sober and precise method. Of greatest importance for the revival was the return to St. Thomas. Breaking a centuries-old tradition they replaced the *Libri Sententiarum* of Peter Lombard with the *Summa* of St. Thomas as the classical text of their lectures and accommodated themselves to the mode of presentation, terminology, and doctrine of Thomas Aquinas. This reform made up for the blunders of the men of the preceding period, who ought to have remained faithful to St. Thomas' transparent clarity and simplicity of mode of exposition, tested terminology, and depth of speculation. It was a blunder on their part to hunt for novelty, merely to avoid repeating the old which had been tested and proven good.

The authors of the new movement kept, in rejecting the old faults and returning to St. Thomas, the right limits; they

¹Dionisio Dominguez, *Historia de la Filosofía* (Santander: Administracion de "Sal Terrae," 1946), p. 461.

showed astonishing moderation and dispassionateness both in their following of the master and their judgment on the teachers of the period of decline. Due to this spirit the Scholasticism of the sixteenth century reached a stage of development which Fr. Ehrle calls unparalleled.²

But this brilliant revival lasted for a relatively short time only. In the seventeenth century when, after the example of Bacon and Descartes, modern English, French, and German philosophy appeared in a variegated succession of systems, Scholasticism began to decline again, and the decadence was rapid and widespread. In the eighteenth century Scholastic currents almost disappeared. Besides an occasional center of Suarezianism^{2(a)} in Spain and Italy, Billuart (1685-1757) and Salvatore Rosselli (died 1783), both of the Dominican Order, were the only Thomists of note.³ Away from the living stream of philosophical development Scholasticism maintained an isolated and miserable existence. It showed no force and made no attempt to defend the truth and vitality of its principles against the one-sided extreme digressions of Rationalism and Empiricism. Some circles of the Scholastic schools anxiously kept aloof from everything new and modern. Contrary to the great masters of the thirteenth century, e.g. Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas, who made everything new in the realm of mind and nature an object of their study, these Scholastics failed to acquaint themselves with the progress of Mathematics, Physics, Chemistry, and Astronomy. They failed to examine critically those problems to which the advances in the different sciences gave rise. In consequence of this neglect they could take no clear stand with regards to the problems and errors of their time. While Cartesian philosophy was already invading the Catholic schools in France and Belgium, some schools in Spain and Italy still busied themselves with trifles and subtle-

²Fr. Ehrle, *Die Scholastik und ihre Aufgaben in unserer Zeit* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder & Co., 1933), p. 31.

^{2(a)}John F. McCormick, S.J., "The Significance of Suarez for a Revival of Scholasticism," in: Charles A. Hart, ed., *Aspects of the New Scholastic Philosophy* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1932), pp. 32-39.

³Louis de Raeymaeker, *Introduction to Philosophy* (New York: Joseph F. Wagner, 1948), p. 161, note 57.

ties consuming energy and time which could and should have been devoted to more serious problems.

On the other hand, schools, especially those attached to universities and for this reason less free to disregard the claims of time, went too far in their admiration for the new and were only too willing to yield to it. They saw the insufficiency of the old philosophy of nature as compared with the new science of nature, but they forgot here and there that the principles of Scholastic metaphysics and epistemology were absolutely sound, and that mathematics and mechanics alone could not solve the deeper metaphysical problems. They failed to realize that it was possible to abandon certain arbitrary applications of metaphysics in the domain of the sciences without abandoning metaphysics itself.

Add here the violence of the French Revolution, the despotic measures of the Napoleonic rule which followed, and the arbitrariness of the sovereigns who did their best to destroy the fruits of the intellectual efforts of former centuries in the field of philosophy and theology. Convents and free schools were suppressed, universities and seminaries were brought into a degrading dependence on the government whose representatives only too frequently were wont to regiment everything according to their own opinion and without regard for the old and approved tradition.⁴

The failure on the part of the Scholastics to see what was true in the new currents and to absorb it into their own system, to meet the doctrinal and scientific demands of the time, had fatal consequences: Scholasticism lost its influence and met only with disregard and contempt. "The Scholastics no longer counted for a force to be reckoned with. Indeed, apart from the value of their doctrines, what general social influence could these men hope to wield who closed their doors and windows against the outside world, and philosophized without the least heed or concern for the dominant ideas of their time?"⁵

Yet, when Scholasticism declined, lost its influence and al-

⁴Cf. Fr. Ehrle, *op. cit.*, pp. 35-37.

⁵M. De Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New*, p. 153.

most disappeared, this decline and failure were not properly a failure of Scholasticism, that is, the Scholastic system itself, but a failure of the men of the period. "Scholasticism lapsed not for want of ideas but for want of men."⁶ The vital parts of Scholasticism remained always sound and healthy; the corrosive action of the causes which encompassed its ruin did not attack its great organic doctrines. Thus the inner unbroken vitality began to burst forth to new life about the time when there were again men with eyes open to its latent force and the new demands of the changed conditions. This took place around the middle of the nineteenth century. The revival started in different countries almost simultaneously. The "Wisdom of the Ancients" had been discovered, and the truth-seeking minds began its excavation. The impulse for the second revival came from Italy.

1. ITALY^{6(a)}

In Italy the movement was vigorous from the start. It was born in the Seminary at Piacenza^{6(b)} due to the initiative of Canon Vincenzo Buzzetti (1777-1824). Among his teachers were two Spanish Jesuits who had to flee from Spain at the time of the suppression of the Society of Jesus in that country. They acquainted him with Scholastic doctrines. Especially under the influence of Father Baltasar Masdeu (1741-1820), of Suarezian tendencies, Buzzetti turned from the rationalism of Descartes and the sensational empirism of Locke and Condillac towards Scholasticism. The study of the writings of Antoine Goudin (1639-1695), "one among the best known professors of philosophy and theology in the second part of the seventeenth century,"^{6(c)} and Father Salvatore M. Roselli (d. 1783) led him definitely towards Thomism. The Bishop of Piacenza

⁶Loc. cit.

^{6(a)}Bernardino M. Bonansea, O.F.M., "Pioneers of the Nineteenth-Century Scholastic Revival in Italy," *The New Scholasticism*, 28: 1-37 January, 1954.

^{6(b)}Louis de Raeymaeker, "Les Origines de l' Institut Supérieur de Philosophie de Louvain," *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, 49: 505 f., November, 1951.

^{6(c)}Bonansea, *op. cit.*, p. 12. note 27.

appointed him professor of philosophy in 1806 and professor of theology in 1808, in which capacity he taught until 1824.

Among his students who played a remarkable role in the restoration of Thomism, the two brothers Domenico Sordi (1790-1808) and Serafino Sordi (1793-1865) occupy a special place. They were most active in their efforts to bring the Society of Jesus, in which the great majority had strong prejudices against the Scholastics, back to the Scholastic tradition. Domenico Sordi became in 1827, under the provincial Fr. Luigi Taparelli d'Azeglio (1793-1862), professor of philosophy in the house of studies at Naples and taught there until 1833. Domenico was a learned man; but because of his hot temper and his indiscrete zeal for Scholasticism, he was relieved of his teaching position; yet the fruits of his labor were abundant and durable. His brother Serafino may be considered as the custodian of Buzzetti's intellectual inheritance. His influence can be scarcely overestimated. In his various positions as professor of philosophy and rector of colleges, he constantly aimed at the restoration of Scholasticism. He combined depth of thought with clearness of exposition. His manuscripts circulated in the houses of studies for the Italian Jesuits and there won followers. He is credited with having given a definite Thomistic orientation to the *Aloisianum*, a center of philosophic studies at Piacenza started in 1839 and still in existence at present in its new seat at Gallarte.^{6(d)} The training of some important figures in the Scholastic revival, such as Fr. Carlo Maria Curci, the founder of the *Civiltà Cattolica* in 1850, Fr. Luigi Taparelli, and Fr. Giuseppe Pecci, brother of Leo XIII, is also to his credit.

Fr. Luigi Taparelli d'Azeglio was especially interested in social philosophy, political economy, and public law which became his special field. A thorough comparative study of the works of modern and contemporary authors with those of the scholastics convinced him of the superiority of Scholasticism over modern philosophy. As professor of moral philosophy at the College of Palermo he edited the famous *Saggio teoretico di diritto naturale* which the *Civiltà Cattolica* later on (1862)

^{6(d)}*Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

praised as "the first Christian treatise of natural law to have appeared in the world."^{6(e)} Back in Rome he became one of the editors of, and main contributors to, the *Civiltà Cattolica*. In his articles, which reveal his command of the Scholastic sources, he tried to apply Scholastic principles to contemporary society in the social and economic order.

Fr. Mateo Liberatore (1810-1892), one among the students at the house of studies at Naples, was appointed to succeed Fr. Domenico Sordi as professor of philosophy. His *Institutiones Logicae et Metaphysicae*, first published in 1840, and the *Elementi di Filosofia*, first published in 1846, went through several successively revised editions which show a progressive transformation of the author. Up to 1850 the writings reveal a rather eclectic trend with dependence on the French Victor Cousin; after 1850 he appears won over to the Thomistic cause and by 1855 his "conversion" was definite and complete. The revised *Institutiones* became an excellent textbook of Thomistic philosophy used in many seminaries throughout Italy and abroad. A long series of articles written for the *Civiltà Cattolica*, of which he was a co-founder and co-editor, defending Thomistic principles against the Italian idealistic philosophy of that time, appeared later (1857 and 1858) in two volumes under the name *Della conoscenza intellettuale*. He contributed also a series of articles to the periodical *Scienza e Fede*, founded at Naples in 1841 by Canon Gaetano Sanseverino (1811-1865).

Fr. Bonansea claims for Gaetano Sanseverino "a place of honor" in the history of Italian Thomism. Sanseverino was a student of Descartes. The Italian revolution of 1848 appears to be a turning point in his development. The articles which he wrote for the periodical *Scienza e Fede* before 1848 deal with Victor Cousin, Kant, de Lammenais, Spinoza and the modern rationalists, "exposing and criticizing contemporary rationalism in order to disclose the errors to which the rejection of divine revelation had led the representatives of that system."^{6(f)} Soon after the revolution, which had a stimulating effect on

^{6(e)}*Ibid.*, p. 22.

^{6(f)}*Ibid.*, pp. 30-31.

Catholic scholars in relation to the teaching of the great scholastics, a change in his outlook took place; he became positively oriented towards Scholasticism. In 1849 he published a study on St. Thomas Aquinas' doctrine on the origin of power and the right of resistance. In 1853 appeared *I principali sistemi della filosofia discussi con le dottrine de'SS. Padri e de'Dottori del medio evo*, a collection in book form of a series of philosophical articles which he had written for *Scienza e Fede* on the request of the Council of Public Instruction in Naples. In 1862 he published his *Philosophia Christiana cum antiqua et nova comparata*, the work in five volumes that was to make him famous. This and the *Elementa philosophiae christianae*, started in 1864 were later condensed by his disciple Nunzio Signoriello (1821-1889) into a two-volume compendium which went through many editions and served as a textbook.^{6(h)} Sanseverino turned to Scholastic philosophy due to a long study of the Scholastic sources and his growing dissatisfaction with modern trends of thought. He himself wrote in the *Philosophia Christiana*:

After many years of exclusive philosophical studies, I finally arrived at the conclusion that for a restoration of philosophy, it was absolutely necessary to go back to the doctrine of the Fathers and Doctors of the Church.⁶⁽ⁱ⁾

Other Italian writers in the development and progress of the movement were: Salvatore Tongiorgi (1820-1865), Giovanni-Maria Cornoldi (1822-1892), a faithful student of St. Thomas and an eminent representative of Thomism from the start^{6(j)}, Tommaso Zigliara (1833-1893), Alberto Lepidi (1838-1897), Francisco Satolli (1839-1909), Benito Lorenzelli (1853-1915), Salvatore Talamo (1864-1932), and Santos Schiffini (1841-1906). The works they produced were numerous.

Bonansea mentions along with the Italian pioneers of the Scholastic Revival in Italy the Jesuit Fr. Joseph Kleutgen (1811-1883), who, although a German, spent about 40 years

^{6(h)} *Ibid.*, p. 34.

⁶⁽ⁱ⁾ *Ibid.*, p. 32.

^{6(j)} Raeymaeker, *op. cit.*, p. 506-607.

in Rome. His *Die Philosophie der Vorzeit vertheidigt* had a tremendous influence not only in Germany, but also in other countries, and especially in Italy, after its translation into Italian (*La filosofia antica esposta e difesa*, 5 vols. Rome and Turin, 1866-1868).

The titles of the works of the Italian Neo-Scholastics are characteristic of their purpose. To quote only a few: *Trattato de la conoscenza intellettuale*; *Del composto umano*; *Degli universali* (Liberatore); *Philosophia christiana cum antiqua et nova comparata*; *I Principali sistemi della filosofia discussi con la dottrina dei SS. Padri e dei Dottori del medio evo* (Sanseverino); *Institutiones philosophicae ad mentem d. Thomae* (De Giorgio); *La filosofia scolastica especulativa di S. Tommaso d'Aquino* (Cornoldi); *Sulla filosofia dei Padri e Dottori della Chiesa e in especialità di S. Tommaso in opposizione alla filosofia moderna* (Capozza); *L'Aristotelismo della Scolastica* (Talamo), etc. One cannot fail to see the express intention to return to the principles of the great masters of the Middle Ages, especially St. Thomas, and to resume and continue the Scholastic tradition.

At first the Italian writers laid special emphasis on the metaphysical aspects of Scholasticism without paying sufficient attention to the sciences and to the history of philosophy⁷ (Zigliara, Lorenzelli, Schiffini, Satolli). With the progress of time, however, this attitude of the promoters of Scholasticism changed in favor of the sciences and history (Talamo, Ballerini, Luis della Chiesa, Sewis, Ag. Gemelli, Fr. Olgiati). Cornoldi put special efforts into proving that Scholastic philosophy is perfectly compatible with modern science, especially modern physics and chemistry. For this purpose he founded at Rome in 1874 together with Travaglini, a physician, a philosophico-medical Academy of St. Thomas which published its own periodical *La scienza italiana*.⁸ Lepidi and Zigliara earned great merit by opposing the Scholastic teaching to, and refuting, Ontologism. Zigliara's *Summa philosophica* served as a textbook in many sem-

⁷M. De Wulf, "Neo-Scholasticism," *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York, 1913), X, p. 749.

⁸Klimke, *op. cit.*, p. 780. Raeymaeker, *op. cit.*, p. 506.

inaries because of its brevity, clarity, and genuine Thomis. Taparelli's *Saggio teoretico di diritto naturale* is considered a classical treatise on natural law.

In our century the neo-Scholastic movement received a remarkable impulse from the Franciscan Ag. Gemelli, whom Dominguez calls "el Mercier italiano."⁹ Francisco Olgiati¹⁰ could report:

... the Italian Neo-Scholastics ... in the first period, owing especially to the initiative of A. Gemelli, ... devoted themselves to the cultivation of the sciences (such as biology and experimental psychology), which, because of their nature, brought to fore purely philosophical problems. The laboratory of psychology, for example, which to-day is under the direction of Father Gemelli, is the best among the laboratories of all the Italian universities, so much so that an adversary like Giuseppe Prezzolini, in a recent work on *La Cultura Italiana* acknowledges that "the Catholicism of Gemelli and of those who work with him shows that it can hold its own beside everything: the microscope and the telescope, the card catalogue and the quotation of texts, studies in psychology and philosophy."

There is such a change of situation in favor of Neo-Scholasticism which was brought about by the fervor of research coupled with a strong and enthusiastic will, that Fr. Olgiati wrote:

... Neo-Scholasticism, in Italy at least, is no longer reproached with having little of scientific and philosophic modernity; the legend that we do not discuss actual problems or that our system is exclusively deductive is no longer repeated, even that other preposterous charge, formerly so generally made, has gone out of fashion, namely, that Neo-Scholasticism is not a true philosophy, but rather "a philosophy by decree," whose conclusions are imposed in advance by the Church, instead of issuing from the free exercise of human reason.¹¹

⁹Dominguez, *op. cit.*, p. 521.

¹⁰Fr. Olgiati, "Italian Neo-Scholasticism and its Relations to Other Philosophic Currents," in John S. Zybura, *Present-Day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism* (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1927), p. 280.

¹¹*Ibid.*, pp. 282-83.

The Papal Colleges Angelicum, San Antonio, San Anselmo, the Gregorian University, the University of the Lateran, the Catholic University of the Sacred Heart at Milan are known centers of intense study of Scholastic thought where enthusiastic and valiant champions of Scholasticism, like Hugon, Garri-gou-Lagrange, Gredt, and others, devoted and still devote their lives to the great cause of Scholasticism and promote its diffusion by incessant publications. The periodicals: *Angelicum*, *Antonianum*, *Studia Anselmiana*, *Divus Thomas*, *Gregorianum*, *La Scienza e la fede*, *Civiltà Cattolica*, *Rivista di filosofia neoscolastica*, *Bolletino Filosofico*, the publications of Quarrachi, all serve the same purpose.

Mention should also be made of the Roman Academy of St. Thomas, founded in 1879 by Leo XIII for the purpose of expounding and commenting on the works of the Angelic Doctor, and for comparing his doctrines with the opinion of other philosophers, thereby spreading "la conoscenza della dottrina del grande Aquinate."

From Italy the movement spread into other European countries and found enthusiastic and powerful supporters.

2. SPAIN

Here where, owing mainly to the Dominican Order which always followed St. Thomas as guide, the thread of Scholastic tradition never had been severed and the connection with the Middle Ages never had been interrupted, the early figures in the new Scholastic movement were Jaime Balmes (1810-1848), Jose Fernandez Cuevas (d. 1864), Card. Ceferino Gonzales (1831-1894), Juan Manuel Orti y Lara (1826-1904), Antonio Comellas y Cluet (1832-1884), Jose Mendive (1836-1906), Juan Jose Urraburu (1841-1904), Marcelino Mendez y Pelayo (1856-1912).¹²

The opinions of historians of philosophy on the genial Bal-

¹²For the writings of the different philosophers cf. Federico Klimke, *op. cit.*, p. 848. — *Enciclopedia Universal Illustrada Europeo-Americana* (Barcelona: Hijos de J. Espasa), XXXVIII, pp. 174-77.

mes, who humanly speaking died much too early, are divergent.¹³ He contributed to the cause of Scholasticism by his *Filosofia fundamental*, *El Criterio*, *Filosofia elemental*. In his main work *Filosofia fundamental* as also in his *El Criterio* he succeeded in masterly fashion to give the Thomistic doctrine the time-desired development and winning form, showing that it was the right mean between the hopelessly disunited principles of modern epistemology and avoided the false extremes of Ontologism as well as of Traditionalism.¹⁴

Outstanding among the Spanish Neo-Scholastics was Card. Ceferino Gonzales, O.P. — assigned for some time to the University of Sto. Tomas at Manila — who tirelessly and vigorously worked for the promotion of the restoration of Scholastic philosophy. In his *Historia de la Filosofia* and occasional studies as well as in his systematic works strictly adhering to the principles of St. Thomas he brought attention to the great fundamental theses of traditional Scholasticism which the Scholastics of the decline had neglected and let fall into oblivion while they busied themselves with trifles. Of special merit in this line was his work *Estudios sobre la filosofia de Santo Tomas*.

Urraburu exercised a strong influence on the continuation of the revival through his voluminous *Institutiones philosophicae* and *Compendium philosophiae scholasticae*. His special merit consists in his effort to keep close contact with the progress of modern physics and the natural sciences which he utilized in the presentation of the traditional doctrine. Herein he shares the spirit of the School of Louvain.

The interest in, and spirit of, historical research found ample (1235-1315) and the Spanish Scholastics of the sixteenth and field for investigation in the writings of Raymond Lull¹⁵ seventeenth centuries.

The steady progress of Neo-Scholasticism in Spain in the twentieth century can be clearly seen from the increasing num-

¹³Cf. D. Dominguez, *op. cit.*, p. 503; Fed. Klimke, *op. cit.*, p. 781; W. Turner, *History of Philosophy* (Boston: Ginn & Co.), p. 641.

¹⁴Klimke, *op. cit.*, p. 781.

¹⁵In the beginning of the twentieth century a special society, "Sociedad Lulista," had been founded for the purpose of propagating the teachings of the Doctor Illuminatus. Its official organ is the Revista Luliana. Cf. Dominguez, *op. cit.*, p. 535.

ber of reviews and periodicals dedicated to the cause of promoting the movement of Neo-Scholasticism, such as *La Ciencia Tomista*, *Criterion*, *Religion y Cultura*, *Estudios Franciscanos*, *Pensamiento*, *Razon y Fe*; and the many monographs in the different branches of philosophy.

In psychology M. Arnaiz (1867-1930) laid emphasis on the spiritual element, opposing in his many publications the tendencies of materialistic psychologists. The special character of the movement as cultivated in Louvain is reflected in the works of Juan Zaragueta. The experimental viewpoint from the outlook of the positive sciences, with the intention, however, of incorporating the modern findings into the traditional Scholasticism, was pursued by Jose Marias. Other names to be mentioned here are: Ugarte de Ercilla, a pupil of Wundt; Barbens, Garcia y Caballero, Barbado, Palmes, Carreras y Artau, Burgos.

A similar tendency to study philosophy in relation to the natural sciences with the view of proving the harmony between the results of the progress of the sciences and traditional philosophy animated Martinez Zacarias, P. G. Arintero, P. de Medio, P. del Pulgar.

The Thomistic metaphysicians of fame deserving mention are Norberto del Prado (*De veritate fundamentali totius philosophiae*) and S. Ramirez, a man of critical mind and extremely vast knowledge, considered by some as one of the greatest Scholastic minds of modern Spain.

Inspiration from Rome and Louvain, the foundation of psychological laboratories and philosophical series, like the psychologico-paedagogical series founded by Palmes and the "Tomistas españoles", public disputations and the efforts of the philosophical section of the Association for the Progress of the Sciences benefited the Scholastic movement.

3. GERMANY

The conditions in Germany were rather different from those in Italy and Spain. A variegated multitude of philosophical tendencies existed in Germany: Kantian Criticism and

Subjectivism; Hegelian idealistico-monistic Pantheism and its opposite extreme, the crass Materialism of Feuerbach and Buchner; Positivism; rationalist Naturalism; diverse directions of Neo-Kantianism; later on Husserl's Phenomenalism; and a variety of other tendencies, with Materialism, Mechanism, Evolutionism, exercising an all-dominating influence. And with the frame of mind of Catholic Germany, such as it was around the beginning of the nineteenth century, Scholasticism seemed to have little chance. Only gradually was the ground being prepared.

The start of the Scholastic movement was preceded and to some extent prepared by a religious movement in the first decades of the nineteenth century which affected and led to the Catholic Church a group of men of high social standing and wide influence who began to make efforts for a restoration of Catholic life and science. The publication (1806-15) of L. von Stolberg's *Geschichte der Religion Jesu Christi* (History of the Religion of Jesus Christ) had an extraordinary influence on the practical life of Germany's Catholics. The so-called Muenster-group, including L. von Stolberg, Clement and Caspar Droste-Vishering, Franz Friedrich, Wilhelm von Fuerstenberg, Amalie Galitzin, Overberg, Katerkamp, Kellermann; at Mainz, the rector and faculty of the seminary, and other groups, exerted great efforts for a restoration of Catholic life and Catholic thought.

In the years around 1820 Prince Johann, from 1854 to 1873 king of Saxony, spread the knowledge of Thomistic philosophy through his commentaries on Dante — "the loyal disciple of St. Thomas" — which appeared under the pseudonym of "Philalethes."

Encouragement to the Scholastic movement came, to some extent, from the Neo-Scholastic revival in Italy; the timely books of Jaime Balmes received much attention in Germany.

The period of Romanticism was passionately interested in the past; this disposition made the nineteenth century a century of history. Great historical syntheses appeared in every domain. Philosophy could not but benefit from these efforts. The intense research work in the field of history of philosophy dug unexpected treasures out of the Middle Ages. And the first

presentations of the *Philosophie der Vorzeit* which had been almost entirely forgotten, affected minds like a new discovery.

From the field of history no small contributions to the preparation of the restoration of sound philosophy were made by H. Windischmann through his extensive work: *Die Philosophie im Fortgang der Weltgeschichte* (Philosophy in the Progress of World History), 1827-34, and by Molitor through a large treatise on the philosophy of history: *Philosophie der Geschichte oder ueber die Tradition* (Philosophy of History or On Tradition), 1826-53.

It was by Josef Kleutgen (1811-83) and Albert Stoeckl (1823-1895) that the restoration of Scholastic philosophy was actually inaugurated. Kleutgen's *Die Philosophie der Vorzeit*,¹⁶ which is an original and classical analysis and defense of the fundamental theses of Scholasticism, represents one of the most important works of neo-Scholastic literature, and contributed to a better knowledge and valuation of Scholastic philosophy in Germany more than any other. At Kleutgen's death, Leo XIII exclaimed: *Erat princeps philosophorum*.^{16a} Also of great influence were the works of Albert Stoeckl: *Die Spekulative Lehre vom Menschen und ihre Geschichte* (The Speculative Doctrine on Man and its History), *Geschichte der Philosophie des Mittelalters* (History of the Philosophy of the Middle Ages), *Lehrbuch der Geschichte der Philosophie* (Manual of History of Philosophy), *Geschichte der Neueren Philosophie* (History of Modern Philosophy), *Lehrbuch der Philosophie* (Manual of Philosophy), and *Grundzuege der Philosophie* (Fundamentals of Philosophy).

The Scholastic restoration was carried on and effectively promoted by Jakob Clemens (1815-1862), Karl Werner (d. 1888), Konstantin Gutberlet (1837-1928), Franz Morgott (1829-1900)¹⁷, Matthias Schneid (1840-1893), Herman Ernst

¹⁶In Italian translation: *La filosofia antica esposta e difesa*. 5 Vols. (Rome and Turin 1866-1868). French: *La philosophie scolastique exposée et défendue* (Paris 1868-1870). Spanish: *La filosofía antigua defendida*.

^{16a}Schaaf, *Conspectus philosophorum recentium*, p. 56, cited by D. Dominguez, *op. cit.*, p. 511.

¹⁷Margott combined speculative ability with the historical method. He entertained a lively correspondence with neo-Scholastics in Italy, France, Spain, and Belgium.

Plassmann^{17(a)} (1817-1864), Ludwig Schuetz (1838-1901), Georg Hagemann (1832-1903), Heinrich Denifle (1844-1905), Georg von Hertling (1843-1918), Ernst Commer (1847-1928), Klemens Baeumker (1853-1924), Joseph Geyser (1869-1948), Martin Grabmann (1875-1949), Gallus Manser (1866-1950), Josef Pieper (b. 1904).¹⁸

With the progress and development of the movement the task became so extensive and manifold that it naturally demanded a division into different fields according to different aspects.

An exact, objective, and complete history of philosophy presupposed the knowledge of the writings of, at least, the more important philosophers of the Middle Ages, which again depended on a critical edition of their philosophical works. The methodologico-critical branch worked out a method and set forth the norms for the research and systematic publication of philosophical Scholastic literature, the study, collection, description, comparison, determination, and classification of the philosophical manuscripts of the Middle Ages which for the greater part were yet unknown treasures, buried in libraries.¹⁹

In this field several writers who distinguished themselves may now be mentioned. Klemens Baeumker, one of the most profound and influential neo-Scholastics, led in the historical research of Scholastic literature and thought. Devotedly adhering to the unchangeable truths of Scholasticism he sought a solution of the philosophical problems of the present. His *Beitraege zur Geschichte des Mittelalters, Texte und Untersuchungen* (*Biblioteca de literatura medioeval* — Contributions to the History of the Middle Ages, Texts and Studies), edited in association with G. von Hertling and Matthias Baumgartner — and

^{17(a)} Cf. Joseph Hoefer, "Hermann Ernst Plassmann" (27.10.1817-23.7.1864, *Theologie und Glaube*, 1965, p. 106-120.

¹⁸ For the complete bibliography of these promoters of Neo-Scholasticism see Michael Buchberger (editor), *Lexikon fuer Theologie und Kirche* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1937), and *Der grosse Herder* (Freiburg i. B.: Herder, 1935), under the respective names. Cf. also Klimke, *op. cit.*, p. 787. For the latest developments in German Scholasticism see: Gerald A. McCool, S.J., "Recent Trends in German Scholasticism: Brunner and Lotz," *International Philosophical Quarterly*, 1:668-682, December, 1961. And Robert F. Havranek, "The Crisis in Neo-Scholastic Philosophy." *Thought*, 38: 529-531, Winter 1963.

¹⁹ Cf. *Gregorianum*, 3 (1922), pp. 198-218; *Nuove proposte per lo studio dei manoscritti della scholastica medievale* by Card. Fr. Ehrle.

later on with Card. Franz Ehrle, Ludwig Baur, Bernhard Geyer, Joseph Geyser, and Franz Pelster — brought to light a great number of medieval works. During the last years the *Beiträge* were edited by Martin Grabmann. By 1947 they consisted of more than thirty-six volumes. Georg von Hertling, who was familiar with the ways of the world and experienced in political life, energetically championed natural law against Positivism, a task for which he was qualified alike by his studies in the history of philosophy and by his metaphysics. Martin Grabmann, indefatigable and prolific, was one of those best acquainted with medieval Scholasticism. He led in international Thomistic research, and above all was highly successful in discovering medieval manuscripts, being probably the best connoisseur of the manuscripts of medieval Scholasticism. Card. Franz Ehrle, prefect of the Vatican Library and a first rate authority on the methodical investigation of medieval Scholasticism, founded in association with Heinrich Denifle *Archiv fuer Literatur und Kirchengeschichte des Mittelalters*. M. De Wulf calls him "a master of medieval history."²⁰ Heinrich Denifle was a disciple of Card. Tommaso Zigliara and had been, since 1883, sub-archivist under Card. Hergenroether of the secret archives of the Vatican. He was a famous palaeographer, German philologist and textual critic, editor of the monumental *Chartularium Universitatis Parisiensis*, author of *Die Universitaeten des Mittelalters bis 1400* (The Universities of the Middle Ages up to 1400), to mention only one of the long list of his works as a proof of his extraordinary erudition.

The historical branch of the movement set for its objective to investigate and promote the knowledge of the origin, development, and relationship of the diverse Scholastic doctrines. Besides the above mentioned scholars fruitful work was also done by Otto Willmann through his *Geschichte des Idealismus* (History of Idealism),²¹ Anton Michelitsch, Franz Pelster, Konstantin Michalski, and Herman Gruber.

²⁰M. De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy* I, p. vi.

²¹Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1951), IV, p. 637. Cf. John S. Zybura, *op. cit.*, p. 426, note 38.

The didactic aspect was cultivated by the authors of complete courses or special treatises composed for use in schools. Here should be named Stoeckl, Gredt, Reinstadler, Gutberlet, Frick, Haan, Boedder, Lehmen, Pesch, V. Cathrein, and many others.²² V. Cathrein treated, in his diverse works, thoroughly, lucidly, and comprehensively ethical problems on an Aristotelian basis, after the mind of St. Thomas and Suarez. "His detailed discussion of Socialism was highly esteemed by Socialists themselves. In his three volumes on *Die Einheit des sittlichen Bewusstseins*, he shows, on the basis of extensive observation, the universal moral disposition of man. Here he comes in very close touch with the famous ethnologist Wilhelm Schmidt, S.V.D., the founder and editor of the *Anthropos*."²³

The opposition which Neo-Scholasticism met in the camps of Neo-Positivism, Phenomenologism, and Neo-Kantianism, and the necessity of defending it led to the development of the apologetic aspect.

The evident progress of the positive sciences raised problems which seemed to overthrow fundamental doctrines of Scholasticism and to be insoluble by Scholasticism. This forced philosophers to study the relation between the positive sciences and Scholasticism and the possibility of incorporating the findings of the positive sciences into the Scholastic system. Joseph Geyser, besides Glossner, Fischer, Grunwald, Gruender, and others, became famous for efforts in this line. By virtue of his critical acumen, metaphysical vision, productive energy, and many-sided knowledge Joseph Geyser is prominent among the modern exponents of the theory of knowledge. "In an eminently happy fashion he assimilates and blends the new and the old."²⁴

An important part in the promotion of the development was played by the "Goerresgesellschaft" (Goerres Society)²⁵ with the

²²Ueberweg, *op. cit.*, pp. 631-44.

²³B. Jansen, "The Neo-Scholastic Movement in Germany," in Zybur, *op. cit.*, p. 261. — Ueberweg, *op. cit.*, pp. 634-35.

²⁴Ueberweg, *op. cit.*, pp. 639-42.

²⁵Founded in 1876 on the occasion of the hundredth anniversary of Goerres' birth for the cultivation of sciences by Catholics of Germany. At present it is composed of eight scientific sections: history, political science, jurisprudence, social and economic sciences, philosophy, natural sciences, archeology, and science of art and literature.

Philosophisches Jahrbuch as official organ of the philosophical section. In 1926 the Goerres Society, with the cooperation of many experts, published the fifth edition of *Staatslexikon*, a work of five volumes with around 1850 pages each.

In 1930 the recently founded special institute for pedagogy at Muenster, Westfalia, under the direction of J. P. Steffes, published the *Lexikon der Paedagogik* in two volumes. The institute had a quarterly publication of its own.

Guided by the conviction that Neo-Scholasticism should be promoted with all possible energy, the German Episcopate, under the leadership of the Archbishop of Cologne, His Em. Card. Karl Joseph Schulte, and with the express approbation and furtherance of the Apostolic See, founded at Cologne in 1922 a Catholic Institute for Philosophy, called the *Albertus Magnus Akademie fuer Neuscholastik*. Its aim was to gradually become a center for the exposition and interchange of philosophical ideas on the basis of the writings of St. Thomas, with a view to a better understanding between the Neo-Scholastics and modern philosophy. A new edition of the works of St. Albert the Great was to be prepared by this Academy.

It is noteworthy that in Germany the restoration of Scholastic philosophy was not an exclusive affair or concern of the clergy, but engaged the interest of a good number of lay scholars in high social standing who out of love and enthusiasm for truth exerted marvelous efforts to bring Scholasticism into the intellectual currents of their time.

Furthermore it is noteworthy "that every German university with a Catholic faculty of theology is required by the State to have a Catholic professor in the department of philosophy to teach Neo-Scholasticism."²⁶

4. FRANCE

In France the conditions, far from inviting the Scholastic way of thinking, were rather an obstacle to it. The philosophy of the eighteenth century in France concluded the century with

²⁶According to B. Jansen, in Zybura, *op. cit.*, p. 263.

atheism and materialism which prepared the ground for the great revolution. The same frame of mind was bequeathed to the nineteenth century. The philosophic tendencies of the nineteenth century developed in the line of atheistic socialism, sensualistic materialism, positivism, eclecticism, Traditionalism, Ontologism, Intuitionism. Upon such ground fell the first seeds of the rising Neo-Scholasticism of Italy through the works of Liberatore and Sanseverino. Their growth and development was effectively retarded by those strong and dominating modern currents. The opposition from those currents explains also why the efforts of the French Neo-Scholastics, for the most part, were of an apologetic and historical character.

Scholastic views against Cartesian teaching were defended by Henri Sauve, Mgr. Bourquard, J. Gardair, P. Mielle. The relation of the soul to the body and the problem of knowledge occupied the main attention of these authors. The scientific character of Aristotelian Metaphysics and its harmony with the experimental sciences, the objective validity of metaphysics and its concepts were defended against Positivism by Domet de Vor- ges, Charles Delmas, Theodore Regnon, De Broglie.

Albert Farges, one of the best interpreters of the Encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, directed his defense of the different Scholastic theses against the modern philosophical currents in general. In a series of studies (*Etudes philosophiques pour vulgariser les théories d'Aristote et de St. Thomas et leur accord avec les sciences*), for the purpose of spreading the philosophy of Aristotle and Thomas and bringing it into contract with the physical and biological sciences, he expounded these topics: The Fundamental Theory of Potency and Act; Matter and Form; Life and the Evolution of the Species; The Brain, The Soul and its Faculties; The Objectivity of Sensation; The Concept of Continuum in Space and Time; The Concept of God; Liberty and Obligation; The Crisis of Certitude. Similar objectives animated Claude Piat, Goerges Fonsegrive, Joseph Bonniot, Thomas Coconnier, T Mainage, A. Sertillanges, J. de Tonquedec, Villard, Fremont, Peillaube, Étienne Gilson.

The restoration of Scholastic philosophy received aid through studies in history and their publication by the already

mentioned Domet de Vorges and Piat; also by P. Ragay, Prosp. de Martigne, Clerval, Mignen, Pierre Mandonnet, Sertillanges.

Manuals of Neo-Scholastic philosophy were written by M. Boylesve, M. Rosset, Grand-Claude, P. Vallet, J. Maritain.

Very important for the realization of the aim to bring Scholasticism in touch with modern thought are the philosophical works of Reg. Garrigou-Lagrange (*Le Sens Commun et la Philosophie de L'Etre; Dieu*) who essays to answer questions asked by present-day thinkers; and Rousselot's *L'intellectualism de St. Thomas*.²⁷

Centers of the Scholastic revival in France are the free Faculties²⁸ of Paris, Lyons, Lille, Angers, and Toulouse which, however, have to contend with great obstacles, because the privileged position of the State universities renders the progress of the free institutions extremely difficult. At the same time it is quite hard for the Scholastic movement to penetrate into the schools under government direction due to the opposition to religious ideas on the part of the French State.

The free faculty of philosophy in the Catholic Institute of Paris has been reorganized according to a programme inspired by the Institut Supérieur de Philosophie of Louvain. Due to this reorganization the Scholastic movement there has taken on a remarkable significance. Its organ is the "Revue de Philosophie." Peillaube, director of the faculty of philosophy, exerted efforts to put Scholasticism in touch with the data of present-day psychology; M. Voisine by his study of questions of the philosophy of nature, achieved the same result. M. Simeterre distinguished himself by devoting himself to the history of ancient philosophy; P. Blanche to a penetrating exposition of metaphysical doctrines. M. Rolland-Gosselin took up the study of ethical and social philosophy.

An important part in the advancement of the Scholastic

²⁷Cf. L. Noël's essay "The Neo-Scholastic Movement in French-speaking Countries" in Zyburga, *op. cit.*, p. 214 ff.

²⁸Free Faculties are those which follow their own programme of studies and are not recognized by the government. The academic degrees conferred upon their students are recognized by the French Law only if those students take part in and pass the examinations at the State universities. Cf. Noël, *op. cit.*

renaissance is played by Jacques Maritain, professor in the Catholic Institute of Paris. Having been a pupil of Bergson and having gone through the course of official instruction, he has a thorough mastery of modern philosophy combined with a full knowledge of the natural sciences. His philosophical training had been finished when he discovered Scholasticism. But it appeared to him as a novelty. He turned and became attached to Thomism with the enthusiasm of a convert, which found expression in a vast number of writings characterized by vigor of philosophic thought and artistic charm of style.²⁹

Noel, concluding his essay cited above, wrote:

Since the time when Msgr. Mercier wrote, the Neo-Scholastic movement has succeeded in compelling the attention of the most hostile quarters.... At Paris, M. Picavet, who gave a course on medieval thought at the Sorbonne, in his chronicles in the *Revue Philosophique* regularly followed the progress of Neo-Scholasticism and noted its modern and scientific character.

Today matters have taken on another aspect. The representatives of modern philosophy have begun to treat St. Thomas and the other Scholastics no longer as writers who may arouse interest but are out of date; rather, they look upon them as teachers from whom modern thought has much to learn. M. Etienne Gilson, who occupies the chair of M. Picavet at the Sorbonne, is perhaps not a Thomist, but he certainly is an admirer of St. Thomas, whom he regards as the father of modern thought, and shows Descartes' dependence on Scholastic thought in many points. M. Blondel, once an adversary of Thomism, is approaching it by ingenious interpretations. On every side the Scholastics are being studied with an interest which is growing sympathetic. This is perhaps the finest result of the long and patient efforts of the Neo-Scholastics to have their philosophy accepted by the modern world (pp. 247/8).

²⁹The fifth volume of the "Thomist" gives a bibliography of Jacques Maritain from 1910-1942, arranged chronologically, pp. 346, 367.

Since M. Léon Noël wrote these lines, M. Étienne Gilson has published a number of excellent works that clearly define his position: *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy* (1940), *God and Philosophy* (1941) *Being and Some Philosophers* (1949), *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* (1950), *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages* (1954), *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas* (1956), *Elements of Christian Philosophy* (1959). In the foreword to *The Christian Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*, he writes:

After many years of study, I am more convinced than ever that the basic metaphysical positions of Thomas Aquinas are still far ahead of what is considered most progressive in the philosophical thought of our own time . . . But only those who have chosen Thomas for their guide know how it is possible to prefer him without despising the rest (p. VIII).

For the French speaking countries Léon Noël concludes:

Scholasticism has ceased to be a dead thought, and has again become a living thought, fully justified in looking forward to an auspicious future.

He wrote this in 1926. Twenty-five years later, however, Charles A. Hart, refers to the eminent French Thomist's, Father de Finance, recent "report of the present status of French philosophy, which could probably be taken as typical of western European philosophy generally," in which Father de Finance "expresses the opinion that Thomism in France is not so strong today as it was twenty years ago because it is a philosophy of order and intellect, and as such it seems to isolate its proponents from other contemporary schools in which reason is held in no such high regard."^{29(a)}

5. SWITZERLAND

In Switzerland the movement of the Scholastic revival was connected with the University of Fribourg. Under the direction

^{29(a)} Charles A. Hart, "Twenty-five Years of Thomism," *The New Scholasticism*, 25:41, January 1951.

of the Dominican Fathers the Faculty of Philosophy kept the Thomistic tradition. Historical works as well as works on the relation of Scholasticism to the particular sciences came forth from this university. Known for its strictly Thomistic character is Gallus Manser's classical work *Das Wesen des Thomismus*.^{29(b)} Manser has taught in Fribourg since 1900 and was, until 1939, on the editorial staff of the *Divus Thomas*.³⁰ P. de Munynk wrote articles on various questions of psychology and of the philosophy of nature, revealing extensive scientific knowledge.

6. BELGIUM

In Belgium, where Cartesianism, Traditionalism, and Rationalism possessed strong power, and Ontologism had become dominant, the Neo-Scholastic movement was inaugurated by Luis de San (1832-1904), Alberto Lepidi, Lupus (1810-1888), Du-

^{29(b)}*Das Wesen des Thomismus*, 3rd ed. Freiburg in der Schweiz: Paulusverlag, 1949. Pp. 728.

³⁰This *Divus Thomas* was founded by Ernst Commer in 1886 under the title *Jahrbuch fuer Philosophie und Spekulative Theologie* which in 1914 received the title *Divus Thomas*. Since 1954 it appears as *Freiburger Zeitschrift fuer Philosophie und Theologie* to distinguish it from the *Divus Thomas, Commentarium de Philosophia et Theologia*, published bimonthly by Collegio Alberoni, Piacenza.

In the first number of the IV. series which started in 1954, the editor, P. Wyser, O.P., explains the reason for the change of the title and outlines the character of the periodical. As "Freiburger Zeitschrift fuer Philosophie und Theologie" the IV. series of the "Jahrbuch" will abide by the scientific tradition which characterized the "Freiburger Schule" from its start and later on also the "Divus Thomas Friburgensis" issuing from it, i.e., the Thomist tradition. Thomist philosophy and theology is impossible without a minimum of adherence to tradition. But precisely because this periodical represents the Thomist tradition it also abides by the principle of St. Thomas that "the argument from authority based on human reason is the weakest" (S. Th. I, 1. 8 ad 2). Hence a so-called "Literal-thomismus" slavishly following every word and sentence of Thomas would undoubtedly be un-Thomistic. Whatever permanent truth the philosophia perennis, and especially St. Thomas, have bequeathed to us must not remain a dead letter with us as little as ancient philosophy and the whole Christian tradition remained a dead letter with Thomas. Each generation is charged with the task, in living thought progress to rethink the old truth and, whenever possible, to develop it in openminded contact with present problems and the established results of modern science. (P. Wyser, O.P. "Zur neuen Serie unserer Zeitschrift", *Freiburger Zeitschrift fuer Philosophie und Theologie* (1:9-10, 1954).

pont, Van der Aa, Gust. Lahousse, Backer (1850-1922), A. van Weddingen, Castelein.

Lupus attacked Traditionalism and Rationalism (*Le traditionalisme et le rationalisme*, Liege, 1858), Lepidi combated Ontologism, especially in the University of Louvain, where it had gained dominant influence through the efforts of G. C. Ubaghs. Dupont^{30(a)} wrote several monographs on Thomistic philosophy (*Essai d'ideologie; Theodicée; Ontologie*). Van Weddingen^{30(b)} contributed to the restoration of Scholastic philosophy through his commentary on the Encyclical *Aeterni Patris* (*L'encyclique de S. S. Léon XIII et la restauration de la philosophie chrétienne*, 1880), a critical essay on the philosophy of S. Anselm and an introductory essay to the study of philosophy.

Perhaps the most important event for the development of the Neo-Scholastic movement was the establishment of the "Institut Supérieur de Philosophie" or "Ecole St. Thomas d'Aquin" at Louvain, inspired by Leo XIII and founded by Card. Mercier.^{30(c)}

By a brief of December 25, 1880, addressed to Card. Deschamps, Leo XIII called upon the bishops of Belgium to establish a chair for the study of St. Thomas at the University of Louvain, a direct knowledge of which he had acquired while Nuncio to Belgium. The executive council of the university heeded the call of the Pope, established the chair of Thomistic philosophy in July 1882, and entrusted it to the then Canon Mercier.

As Leo XIII saw it, the success of the restoration of Scholasticism called for the study of Scholastic philosophy and especially of St. Thomas in close contact with that of the sciences and modern thought. For this reason Mercier began to make a

^{30(a)} Cf however, Raphael Tambuyser, "L'érection de la chaire de philosophie thomiste à l'Université de Louvain (1880-1882)," *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, 56:498-499, Août, 1958.

^{30(b)} *Ibid.*, p. 498 ff.

^{30(c)} Joseph J. Harnett, "Désiré Joseph Mercier and the Neo-Scholastic Revival," *The New Scholasticism*, 18: 303-333, October, 1944. Tambuyser, Raphael, "L'érection de la chaire de philosophie thomiste à l'Université de Louvain (1880-1882)," *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, 56:479-509, August, 1957. Louis de Raeymaeker, "Les origines, de l'Institut..." *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, 49: 505 ff, November, 1951

thorough investigation of the sciences and modern thought. Léon Noël, third president of the Institut Supérieur, reports:³¹

In the course of his teaching at Malines he had mastered the doctrines of St. Thomas, he had appraised the solid good sense of these doctrines, at once so serene and so positive, scaling the loftiest heights of things divine without losing touch with the sensible realities or for a moment letting go the rigorous chain of logical reasoning. He had likewise examined the works of the teachers who dominated European thought about this time; the positivists and the English and French psychologists. Everything in their work was traced to experience, and forthwith a rapprochement between these tendencies and the Aristotelian aspect of Thomism presented itself. In order to reach contemporary minds, it was of great importance to point out to them how the highest speculations of scholastic doctrine were linked with the data of facts. But it would not be enough to appeal to everyday observation. For the nineteenth century the reality of things disclosed itself in its truest aspect in the retort of the chemist, under the scalpel of the anatomist, under the microscope of the biologist. It was therefore with science founded on such researches that the traditional doctrine had to be brought into contact.

In Paris, then, he assiduously followed the courses and clinics of Charcot, whose theories on mental diseases were then all the rage. At Louvain he attended

... courses in physiology, chemistry, and mathematics. In the laboratory of Van Gehuchten he attended the experiments and witnessed the discovery of the great neurologist; he became the disciple of the celebrated chemist Louis Henry. He requested Paul Mansion to unveil to him the profound meaning of mathematics, and Msgr. De Harlez to initiate him to the secret of linguistics. He passionately followed the admirable researches of Van Beneden and Carnoy. No scientific domain remained unfamiliar to him; his mind was nourished with the same abund-

³¹L. Noël, *op. cit.*, pp. 218-19.

ance of facts, he accustomed himself to follow the same methods as the practitioners of observation and experimenters of the laboratory. And he had an advantage over them in that he could point out in what way their verifications were insufficient, their theories inadequate, and along their own beaten paths he led them on to the problems and their solutions presented by philosophy.

On the other hand, when Mercier began his exposition of Thomism, students of the various faculties were attracted first by curiosity; soon, however, by the nature of the subject lectured upon.

The sense of the need for an environment "where contact is established between the researches, where the savants can follow the projects of the philosophers and the philosophers receive and ponder the suggestions of the savants," led to the plan to found the *Institut Supérieur de Philosophie* which was realized in 1888.³² This institute, besides being an institution in the ordinary sense of a school, was to be, first and foremost, "a center of study and research where work would be done on 'science in the making'."³³

In 1894 Mercier founded the *Revue Néo-Scholastique* to be for the world "the mouthpiece of the new school." The "Bibliothèque de L'Institut Supérieur de Philosophie" published the successive volumes of the *Cours de Philosophie: Psychologie, Logique, Criteriologie, Ontologie, Origines de la Psychologie Contemporaine, Définition philosophique de la Vie* (Mercier), *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale* (M. De Wulf), *Cosmologie ou Étude philosophique du monde inorganique* (D. Nys), *Traité élémentaire de Philosophie à l'usage des classes* (Mercier, M. De Wulf, D. Nys).

In accordance with a method proper to it, the Institute continues to bring renovated Scholasticism into close relations with the experimental sciences. It has a laboratory of experimental psychology. In his *Cosmology*, the fruit of long years of

³²M. De Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New*, pp. 263-317. ("Philosophy and Sciences at Louvain"; "The Project of a Philosophical Institute at Louvain"). See, *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, x, p. 149.

³³*Ibid.*, p. 289 ("Organization of Courses of the Institute").

devotion to the philosophy of the sciences of matter, Nys shows "how, of all the systems, the Aristotelian-Thomistic is that which best accords with the data of scientific experiment as well as every-day experience."^{33(a)} An outstanding work among the results achieved by the Institute of Louvain is M. De Wulf's *Histoire de la philosophie médiévale*, an historical synthesis of Scholastic thought. The study of the social philosophy of St. Thomas was pursued by S. Deploige, who published *Le conflit de la morale e de la sociologie*. L. Noël published *Notes d'epistemologie Thomiste*.³⁴

Representatives of note of the Neo-Scholastic movement at Louvain at present are Louis de Raeymaeker, President of the Higher Institute of Philosophy and Director of the *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, Ferdinand van Steenberghen; Albert Dondeyne; and Jacques Leclercq, president of the School of Political and Social Sciences.

From many countries students arrive to study the method and spirit of the Institute. Later, in their respective home centers of studies, they win new minds to the Scholastic movement.³⁵

In the Jesuit "Collège Philosophique et Théologique" at Louvain, J. Maréchal, devoting his attention to systematic problems of Neo-Scholasticism, traced in his *Le point de départ de la Métaphysique* the history of the critical problem from the Greeks down to present-day philosophers to show how the Aristotelian-Thomistic philosophy contains the solution of the problem.

The *Revue des Sciences philosophique et théologique*, published by Dominicans, brings the most complete and important bulletins referring to all branches of philosophy.

A proof of the growing and winning force of the Neo-Scho-

^{33(a)} Leon Noël *op. cit.*, p. 233.

³⁴For more detailed information on the literature see the appendix ("Philosophical Literature at the Institute") to De Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New*, pp. 311-16.

³⁵P. Coffey, *op. cit.*, p. 291: "Not only the continental countries, France, Holland, Germany, Poland, Switzerland, Italy, Spain, but the English-speaking countries England, Ireland, Canada, the United States, have been sending and are still sending their present and future professors of scholastic philosophy to the University of Louvain."

lastic movement may be seen in the foundation of the "Société scientifique de Bruxelles" that set for its aim the promotion of the sciences to produce new evidence for the Scholastic principle that between reason and faith there can be no contradiction. Its two publications *Annales de la société scientifique de Bruxelles* and *Revue des questions scientifiques* helped to establish the recognition of the scientific character of Neo-Scholasticism.

7. EASTERN EUROPE

In Hungary and the Slavic countries the Neo-Scholastic movement is in constant progress. Philosophic societies as, for instance, the "Societas Thomistarum Regionum Slavorum" or "The Philosophic Society of St. Thomas Aquinas of the University of Lublin," and philosophic congresses indicate its growth.

8. ENGLAND

In England the return to the great masters of the Middle Ages came only after the appearance of the Encyclical *Aeterni Patris*. *The Metaphysics of the Schools* (1881), by Thomas Harper, is the result of the first elaborate attempts at presenting Scholastic philosophy in a form accessible to modern English readers. The publication of the Stonyhurst Series, probably the most noteworthy Neo-Scholastic product in English, has led to a remarkable change of opinion regarding the value of Scholastic philosophy. It comprises *Logic* (Richard F. Clarke), *First Principles of Knowledge* (John Rickaby), *Moral Philosophy: Ethics, Deontology, and Natural Law* (Joseph Rickaby), *Natural Theology* (Bern. Boedder), *Psychology, Empirical and Rational* (Mich. Maher), *General Metaphysics* (John Rickaby), *Political Economy* (Ch. S. Davis), *Theories of Knowledge: Absolutism, Pragmatism, Realism* (Leslie J. Walker), *Principles of Logic and Principles of Natural Theology* (George H. Joyce). Excellent are the books written by P. Coffey, Professor of Logic and Metaphysics at Maynooth College, Ireland: *The Science of*

Logic, in two volumes; *Epistemology*, in two volumes; and *Ontology*. R. P. Phillips wrote *Modern Thomistic Philosophy* in two volumes.

9. THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

According to the Dominican Father Edward G. L. Van Becelaere³⁶, the first to make a survey of Scholastic philosophy in America, "the first impulse toward a distinctively American presentation of Scholasticism came in 1873, when Saint Louis University began offering philosophy courses in English for interested laymen." No notable names appear prior to the publication of the *Aeterni Patris* of Leo XIII. In colleges and seminaries of the time such as Georgetown, St. Louis, Mt. St. Mary's at Emmitsburg, Notre Dame in Indiana, St. John's later to become Fordham University, Manhattan, St. Mary's of Baltimore, Mt. St. Mary's in Cincinnati, and St. Francis in Milwaukee, brief attention was given to Scholastic philosophy mixed with considerable eclecticism, Cartesianism, and the ontologism of Gioberti.³⁷

Outside Catholic centers Scholastic philosophy was either entirely ignored or, if known at all, was much misunderstood. Charles A. Hart considers as typically representative of such attitudes "the criticism of the aims and value of the *Aeterni Patris* urged by Professor Alexander of Columbia University, writing in the *Princeton Review* of March 1880."³⁸

The presence of leaders of Scholastic thought was evidenced by the reaction to this publication. Professor Alexander's criticism received a "thorough-going, vigorous, point by point reply" by the editor of the *Catholic World*, which together "with the *American Catholic Quarterly Review* constituted the chief American mediums for the thoughts of Scholastic philosophers

³⁶James Collins, "A Quarter Century of American Philosophy," *The New Scholasticism*, 25:64, January, 1951. Charles A. Hart, *Aspects of the New Scholastic Philosophy* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1932), p. 20.

³⁷Charles A. Hart, "Twenty-five Years of Thomism," *The New Scholasticism*, 25:5, January, 1951.

³⁸Charles A. Hart, *op. cit.* p. 18.

of that day. These two periodicals regularly carried articles of a definitely Thomistic viewpoint.”³⁹

An important response to the *Aeterni Patris* was the founding of the pontifical Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C. in 1887. Its journal, the *Catholic University Bulletin*, provided such names as Pace, Clark, Ming, Kearney, Kenedy, Turner, Shanahan, and Driscoll, among others, a medium for a brilliant discussion of a multitude of phases of Scholasticism in its own content and in its relation to contemporary thought.

The development of the Neo-Scholastic movement in America is furthermore connected with the names of Jouin, Poland, Coppens, Brother Azarias, Brother Chrysostom, Hill, Russo, Gruender, Gmeiner, and Fulton Sheen.

Father Jouin, S.J., published two volumes of *Elementa Philosophiae* and an English text of logic and metaphysics which ran through many editions. Father Jouin’s works started “a long line of Scholastic Treatises by American Jesuit professors in every succeeding decade since 1879”: Father Walter Hill, Father Charles Coppens (*Moral Principles and Medical Practice*), Father Poland (*Truth of Thought*) of St. Louis University; Father John J. Ming (*Data of Modern Ethics Examined*) of Canisius College in Buffalo; and Father Nicholas Russo (*Summa Philosophiae*). Father R. I. Holaind lectured before the students of the Georgetown School of Law on “Natural Law and Legal Practice.” All these works aimed at showing the vitality of Scholastic principles in the thought of the day. “In written defense of Scholasticism in America this Society has been the very bulwark of the movement.”⁴⁰

Of the Brothers of the Christian Schools, Brother Azarias (*Philosophical Essay*) insisted “that there must not merely be a revival but an adapted and progressive Scholasticism with bearing upon present problems,” while Brother Chrysostom (*Elementary Course of Christian Philosophy*) “sought rapprochement with non-Scholastic American philosophers through

³⁹*Loc. cit.*

⁴⁰*Ibid.*, p. 19; cf. p. 26.

his active membership in the American Philosophical Association and articles in the *Philosophical Review*.”⁴¹

Father Gerard Esser, S.V.D., one time president of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, through many years taught Scholastic philosophy in the major seminary of the Society of the Divine Word in the U.S.A. at St. Mary's, Techny, Illinois. He published his own textbooks in all divisions of philosophy.

John Gmeiner (*Medieval and Modern Cosmology*), a German professor at St. Francis Seminary in Milwaukee, and John Driscoll (*Treatise on the Human Soul; God*) of Albany, New York, one of the early graduate students at the Catholic University of America, belonged to the diocesan clergy. An outstanding figure among the diocesan clergy is Bishop Fulton Sheen, *agrégé en Philosophie à l'université de Louvain* and professor of philosophy at the Catholic University of America. Widely used are the textbooks of Celestine N. Bittle, O.F.M.Cap.

The Neo-Scholastic movement had and has its graduate research centers in Scholastic philosophy at the School of Philosophy, Catholic University of America in Washington, D.C.; at Fordham University in New York; St. Louis University in Missouri; Notre Dame University in Indiana, where recently a Medieval Institute has been established; Loyola University in Chicago and Marquette University in Milwaukee. Each year Marquette University presents the distinguished Aquinas Lecture which is subsequently published by the University's press. From all these centers a large number of doctoral dissertations appear. “From its beginning the Catholic University of America, under the guidance of Professors Pace and Shanahan, pupils of the brilliant Satolli, and later that of William Turner, has always been a center of Scholastic philosophy.”⁴² The School of Philosophy at the Catholic University of America has, since its founding, published nearly two hundred doctoral dissertations on almost every phase of Thomistic philosophy.⁴³

⁴¹*Ibid.*, p. 20.

⁴²*Ibid.*, pp. 21-22.

⁴³Charles A. Hart, “Twenty-five Years of Thomism,” *The New Scholasticism*, 25:5 and 43-44.

A number of periodical publications serve the cause of the Neo-Scholastic movement. There is *The New Scholasticism*, the official journal of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, organized at a meeting of American Scholastic philosophers at the Catholic University of America on January 6, 1926, "the real center of a noteworthy cooperative enterprise."⁴⁴ Its annual *Proceedings* contain the papers read at the Association's annual meetings. It also publishes occasional studies on special topics. *The Modern Schoolman* is a quarterly journal of philosophy published by the College of Philosophy and Letters and the Department of Philosophy at Saint Louis University. *Thought*, edited at Fordham University, includes a considerable section devoted to philosophical studies. Since 1961 the Philosophy Department of Fordham University in New York, in collaboration with the Jesuit philosophical faculty of Berchmans Philosophicum in Heverlee-Louvain has been editing the *International Philosophical Quarterly*, an intercultural forum for basic philosophical ideas. IPQ does not mean "commitment to any particular school or method, such as phenomenology, linguistic analysis, Scholasticism, etc." It "has been founded with the express purpose of bringing face to face in a single forum... the main currents of both western and eastern philosophical thinking." Its "second and equally primary objective springs from the conviction that the deepest bond of unity both between Europe and America and between East and West... lies within the perspectives of the great living stream of theistic, spiritualist, and personalist philosophy."⁴⁵ *Philosophy Today*, edited and published by Fathers of the Society of the Precious Blood since 1957, four times a year, offers selective presentations from current periodical literature in philosophy and is directed to the interests of scholars and teachers within the Christian tradition. The Dominican Fathers of the Province of St. Joseph edit *The Thomist*. A remarkable contribution to the movement is made by the Philosophical Series of the Duquesne Studies, Duquesne University.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, p. 43.

⁴⁵*International Philosophical Quarterly*, 1:1-2 February 1961.

Prominent Thomists like Jacques Maritain, Etienne Gilson, Maurice de Wulf have occasionally been invited by such universities as Harvard, Princeton, Yale and Indiana to give brief lecture series on phases of Scholastic philosophy or on subjects closely related to it and treated in its spirit. Some of these series have been published. A serious study of Thomism was inaugurated in the thirties at the University of Virginia by a group of professors and students, largely in connection with the study of medieval philosophy. Professors Scott Buchanan, Lewis Hammond, and W. K. Smith established a Theology Series at the University with weekly lectures on Thomistic treatises, where Mortimer Adler was a regular lecturer.⁴⁶

10. CANADA

In Canada the Neo-Scholastic movement started earlier than in the United States. Long before the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* of Leo XIII appeared, St. Hyacinth College under Msgr. Desaulniers had promoted Scholasticism in opposition to the eclecticism and ontologism quite prevalent at the time in Catholic colleges and seminaries. *The Philosophy of the Bible* (1876) by Cornelius O'Brien, a Canadian philosopher and *littérateur*, a work devoted to natural theology, rational psychology and special ontological problems, was perhaps the first notable contribution to the new Scholastic cause. Other Canadian contributions are the three volumes on *Elementa Philosophiae Christianae* by Abbé Stanislaus A. Lortie, the *Précis de Métaphysique* by Brother Symphorien-Louis, the *Histoire de la Philosophie* by Abbé Robert, and the numerous articles by Bishop Alexander MacDonald.

One of the centers for Neo-Scholastic studies is the Institute of Medieval Studies, St. Michael's College, University of Toronto. This Institute was established under the direction of the Basilian Fathers "with the renowned medieval scholar Dr. Etienne Gilson as Director, and Dr. Gerald B. Phelan, of the faculty of

⁴⁶Charles A. Hart, "Twenty-five Years of Thomism," *The New Scholasticism*, 25:4.

St. Michael's and a member of the Executive Committee of the American Catholic Philosophical Association, as secretary."⁴⁷ Other centers are the Institute of Medieval Studies, University of Montreal; the Graduate School of Ottawa; and the University of Laval, Quebec, "the most important center of Scholastic philosophy in Canada." St. Michael's College "has shared with Laval University in making Scholasticism a system to be reckoned with among the philosophies of America." *Laval théologique et philosophique* is its periodical publication.

This historical summary of the revival and development of Scholasticism shows that the revival in all countries started with a return to the old masters. Their doctrine, almost entirely forgotten, is brought to light again, expounded, and contrasted with the modern currents. Soon the movement brings the traditional doctrine in contact with the rapidly progressing particular sciences in order to integrate their positive results. Histories of philosophy appear, manuals of philosophy are composed, monographs written, laboratories built, many periodicals come into existence, chairs of Scholastic and Thomistic philosophy are erected, associations and academies founded, congresses held.⁴⁸ All these suggest that Neo-Scholasticism is gaining ground.

Robert F. Harvanek, after selectively listing works of the last decade,⁴⁹ quotes Edward A. Sillem⁵⁰: "During the past few years the libraries of students of St. Thomas's philosophy have been filling at an unprecedented rate with books of the very first importance. A refreshing spring seems to be enlivening the contemporary Thomist world..."

However, despite this spring, an alarm is sounded. A "crisis" seems to be felt. Teachers of Thomism are beginning to sense a new spirit and a new resistance in their students and younger colleagues.

⁴⁷Ch. A. Hart, *Aspects of the New Scholastic Philosophy*, p. 18.

⁴⁸Cf. Raeymaeker, *Introduction to Philosophy*, pp. 185-258.

⁴⁹"The Crisis in Neo-Scholastic Philosophy," *Thought* 38: 530 § 2, Winter 1963.

⁵⁰"New Approaches to the Metaphysics of St. Thomas," *The Clergy Review*, XLVII, No. 2 (February, 1962), 96-111.

At a workshop on the teaching of Thomism today conducted at the Catholic University in June, 1962, Father Benedict Ashley, O.P., expressed an apprehension that something had happened to the public reception of St. Thomas in this country in recent years, even among Catholics. . . In the past. . . St. Thomas had a very good position among us, but recently there seemed to be a resistance to his philosophy.⁵¹

E. Gilson, writing in *Aquinas*, III (1960): *De Reditu ad Sanctum Thomam* (Rome: Pontificia Universitas Lateranensis), remarks: "There has been some resistance from the beginning, and there will continue to be. In fact, if one is to believe the chorus of witnesses from both the New World as in the Old, this resistance has taken on a new vigor among the young people in Catholic schools" ("La paix de la sagesse," *Aquinas*, pp. 28-46)⁵²

Fr. Humbert Degl'Innocenti, O.P. writes: "One frequently hears even clerics say that St. Thomas ought to be dropped because he 'does not meet the needs of our times, and is not in harmony with the mentality of our day.' Aquinas, the story goes, belongs in the Middle Ages, a barbarous age of darkness and ignorance. He has been surpassed and transcended, and his teaching should be placed in a museum for philosophical-theological antiquities, since as a matter of fact, it cannot satisfy anyone today."⁵³

Father Joseph de Finance, S.J., starts his discussion of the "Value and Task of Thomism Today" by observing:

Here it is now forty years since Maritain saluted St. Thomas as the apostle of modern times (*Le Docteur Angélique*, Paris, Descle, 1930, pp. 85-125). That was the golden age of the Thomist revival, a joyous springtime of beautiful promises. . . Have these promises been fulfilled? One has to be courageous and say that after a brilliant flowering, at least in some countries of Europe, Thomism ap-

⁵¹Harvanek, *op. cit.*, p. 531

⁵²Harvanek, *loc. cit.*

⁵³Harvanek, *op. cit.*, p. 532.

pears to have lost its vitality and in any case no longer exercises the same attraction in intellectual circles. It would be an extremely delicate task to determine the causes of this decline; the factors that come into play differ from place to place. Let us leave the determination of these causes to the future historians of our age. Here and now, this crisis offers Thomists the occasion of a double reflection: the first on the essential values which today as yesterday and perhaps more than yesterday recommend Thomism to Christian thought; the other, on the more general conditions which permit it to respond to the interest of our times. ("Valeur et tâches actuelles du thomisme," *Aquinas*, 136-150)⁵⁴

In her article "Thomism Today" Rosemary Lauer⁵⁵ presents a survey of the present situation in the teaching of philosophy in American Catholic colleges and universities. One of her concluding paragraphs reads:

The majority of young Catholic teachers of philosophy, most of whom are laymen, while they may know St. Thomas at least as well as their elders do, are not committed to Thomism. This is not, as some have maintained, because they have despaired of metaphysics — though a few have done so — but because they find the metaphysical approach of a Merleau-Ponty or a Gabriel Marcel much more meaningful today than that of St. Thomas. Consequently, prognostications are made that within ten or fifteen years Thomism will enjoy in Catholic schools only the status of "a" philosophy rather than "the" philosophy.

In 1951 Mortimer J. Adler wrote: "I cannot be optimistic about genuine philosophical progress in the next twenty-five years, so far as the contribution of Scholastic philosophers is concerned."⁵⁶ According to him the growing number of the

⁵⁴Harvanek, *loc. cit.*

⁵⁵Rosemary Lauer, "Thomism Today", *Commonweal*, 80:39-42, April 1964.

⁵⁶Mortimer J. Adler, "The Next Twenty-five Years in Philosophy," *The New Scholasticism*, 25:96, January, 1951.

“medieval revivalists” among contemporary Scholastics darkens the hope that the program of philosophical work for our days indicated by Jacques Maritain, a “modern Thomist”, in *The Degrees of Knowledge* will be carried out. Among them there is the tendency to “conceive *philosophia perennis*, not as something perpetually and continuously growing, but as something perennially and reiteratively the same. . . . The work of philosophy was completed by Thomas Aquinas, and. . . our only task is to teach his doctrines faithfully and well to all future generations.”

CHAPTER IV

CAUSES OF THE REVIVAL AND FURTHER DEVELOPMENT OF SCHOLASTICISM

The general attitude of the century preceding the revival of Scholastic philosophy towards Scholasticism was that of contempt for it. The idea of the Middle Ages as of the "night of a thousand years" found even shortly before the close of the nineteenth century a new, unmistakable expression and support in the work of M. Penjon.¹ He suggested that, in a history of philosophy, the period from the beginning of the sixth century to the Renaissance in the fifteenth century be skipped, because, during that interval there was, properly speaking, no philosophy. According to this view human thought for ten centuries, "sunk in the slough of barbarism," had fallen into a deep sleep from which it never awakened. The result of the efforts of ten centuries was labeled gibberish. How, therefore, did it come about that Scholastic philosophy found entrance into the society of the nineteenth century with such an attitude? What aroused it from its profound sleep? How did it gain new friends and even command the attention of unfriendly minds?

The first answer is found in the fundamentally metaphysical disposition of the human mind which, in its depths, thirsts for a unified, synthetic, and ultimate explanation of all reality, on the one hand, and in the failure of the contemporary currents of thought to still that yearning, on the other. For, while the positive sciences increase our knowledge in extent rather than in depth, it is metaphysics and only metaphysics that can bestow upon this knowledge unity, comprehensiveness, and significance.

1. THE MIND'S BASICALLY METAPHYSICAL DISPOSITION.

The human mind naturally craves after knowledge. Aristotle stated this fact as the first proposition of his *Metaphy-*

¹See ch I, note 24.

sics. The desire to know embraces all reality. It cannot be limited arbitrarily. It extends to the world around us, within us, and above us, to things sensible and supra-sensible, to whatever is knowable. Now whatever is capable of existence, is also knowable; "quidquid enim esse potest, intelligi potest."² And the human mind is not satisfied with factual knowledge, the mere registering of facts; it seeks to grasp their nature and comprehend their causal interrelations; it strives after ultimate answers, after a comprehensive, synthetic view of the whole of reality.³ This restless bent towards deeper comprehension of all being is the natural expression or manifestation of the basically metaphysical disposition of the human mind. The entire history of philosophy is a continuous proof of the incessant endeavor of the thinking mind to reach that final metaphysical world-view. Never could this metaphysical endowment of the human mind be entirely disregarded. There is no period of human thought without any metaphysical trait. At all times the mind followed the tendency to work out a unified and comprehensive knowledge of the whole of being, a metaphysical synthesis. Even the adversaries of metaphysics are deeply involved in metaphysics. The systems of Phenomenalism, Positivism, and Agnosticism, from which the modern prejudice denying the very possibility of metaphysics arises, are no less metaphysical than erroneous.

Since the inauguration, by scientific discoveries of the era of enthusiastic nature-study in the transition period to modern philosophy, the modern epoch witnessed a powerful rise of the positive sciences. The inductive methods, Bacon's undue emphasis of which started the line of empirical tendencies, forced na-

²*Contra Gentiles*, II, 98.

³Cf. Leo XIII: "Nor will the physical sciences, which are now in such great repute, and by the renown of so many inventions draw such universal admiration to themselves, suffer detriment but find very great assistance in the re-establishment of the ancient philosophy. For the investigation of facts and the contemplation of nature is not alone sufficient for their profitable exercise and advance; but when facts have been established it is necessary to rise and apply ourselves to the study of the nature of corporeal things, to inquire into the laws which govern them and the principles whence their order and varied unity and mutual attraction in diversity arise." "Aeterni Patris," in *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII*, (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), p. 55.

ture to yield up more and more of her secrets. "The history of the sciences during the last three centuries, especially during the nineteenth, is like the tale of one grand triumphal march of the human mind."⁴ The steadily progressing conquest of nature revealed ever new aspects of reality, widened the field of inquiry, and thereby raised the need for additional branches in the different sciences. Multiplication and growing specification of the sciences was the result, and a vast increase of factual knowledge that called for simplification and unification from a higher viewpoint. Only philosophy could be expected to solve that task.

All sincere thinkers will recognize that no ultimate question about the totality of human experience can be solved by any science which explores merely a portion of this experience. Nay, the more rapid and extensive is the progress of the various special sciences, the more imperative and insistent becomes the need to collect and collate their separate findings, to interrogate them one and all as to whether and how far these findings fit in with the facts and conditions of human life and existence, to determine what light and aid they contribute to the solution of the great and ever recurring questions of the *whence?* and *whither?* and *why?* of man and universe . . .

"The farther science has pushed back the limits of the discernible universe, the more insistently do we feel the demand within us for some satisfactory explanation of the whole."⁵

2. THE FAILURE OF CONTEMPORARY SYSTEMS.

By the middle of the nineteenth century, the time of the revival of Scholasticism, philosophy was seemingly discredited. The situation was almost desperate. On the whole, the philosophies of the modern epoch were marked by a strong tendency of individualism which reached its climax in the second half of the nineteenth century, especially in Germany. All new currents started with great pretensions, claiming to

⁴M. De Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New*, p. 200.

⁵P. Coffey, *Ontology* (New York: Peter Smith, 1938), p. 27.

inaugurate an entirely new development of philosophic thought. The result was such a split of philosophical views and such a confusion as could not have been greater. Each individual philosopher tried, as it were, to cut off the other's water and to present his system as the Alpha and Omega of all wisdom. Numerous systems came forth simultaneously or in quick succession, one overthrowing the other but none taking a permanent, overmastering hold of men's minds "that rebelled against the void in which they were being forced to languish and to die."⁷ In all countries a similar situation obtained.

Thus we have in Germany, for instance, the coexistence of contrary and mutually exclusive systems: Full-fledged Idealism and radical Materialism, with a variety of systems between these two extremes, reflecting or modifying in a larger or smaller degree the tenets of either.

Fichte's pure Idealism, the first of a series of efforts to perfect the incomplete synthesis of Kant, aimed at supplying a single principle of all that existed. Kant's practical reason as well as the theoretical, the material as well as the forms of representation and thought, everything must be deducible from a single principle which Fichte found in the conscious Ego. The real distinction between matter and spirit, object and subject, was obliterated, the "thing-in-itself" of Kant absorbed into the thinking subject which alone remained. This was pure Idealism, admitting of nothing transcendental. Being was reduced to, and deduced from, thought: Idealistic Monism and Pantheism.

⁶"To the old teaching a novel system of philosophy has succeeded here and there, in which we fail to perceive those desirable and wholesome fruits which the Church and the civil society itself would prefer. For it pleased the struggling innovators of the sixteenth century to philosophize without any respect for faith, the power of inventing in accordance with his own pleasure and bent being asked and given in turn by each one. Hence it was natural that systems of philosophy multiplied beyond measure, and conclusions differing and clashing one with another arose about those matters even which are the most important in human knowledge. From a mass of conclusions men often come to wavering and doubt; and who knows not how easily the mind slips from doubt to error? But as men are apt to follow the lead given them, this new pursuit seems to have caught the souls of certain Catholic philosophers, who, throwing aside the patrimony of the ancient wisdom, chose rather to build up a new edifice than to strengthen and complete the old by aid of the new — ill-advisedly, in sooth, and not without detriment to the sciences." "Aeterni Patris," *op. cit.*, p. 52.

⁷Jacques Maritain, "The Contemporary Attitude Towards Scholasticism," in Zyburas, p. 186.

The absorption of external nature into the thinking subject as taught by pure Idealism was too violent a measure to satisfy the human mind. For this reason, Schelling put nature back in its place, but nonetheless retained a pantheist-idealistic viewpoint. By making the object (nature or non-ego) not merely a pure opposition to the Ego, but leaving it a positive value, and deriving both from a common source, the indifferent Absolute, Schelling transformed the subjective Idealism into an objective Idealism.

Hegel, like Fichte and Schelling, pursued the same aim, that is, to deduce all reality of nature and mind from a single supreme principle. In Fichte's subjective Idealism nature (non-ego, thing-in-itself) was reduced to a mere self-restriction of the Ego. Schelling's objective Idealism tried to give the non-ego (nature, object) a similar position in the development of the Absolute as the reality of the mind, by conceiving the Absolute as the indifferent identity of the object and the subject. Hegel wanting, like Schelling, to leave the non-ego its value, tried to deduce it not from the indifferent Absolute, but from the concept, the absolute idea. His Idealism became absolute Idealism, logical Idealism or Panlogism. Being and thought are perfectly identical, reality is mind. To explain being, we must discover the law of development of the idea, because all being is thought realized, and all becoming is a development of thought. Hegel's Idealism is essentially pantheistic, and it was Hegel's Pantheism that more than any other pantheistic system contained the germ of Materialism.

Though Hegel exercised an extraordinary influence upon contemporary minds, so that "it is safe to say that no department of human knowledge has failed to feel the influence of Hegel's doctrines, or at least of his method,"⁸ he exercised no exclusive control of the scene. Alongside the great idealist system individual philosophers, partly in dependence on Hegel, partly in opposition to him, set up new systems with divergent tendencies. The leftwing Hegelians, following the dialectical method of Hegel, drove the development directly towards Mater-

⁸Turner, *History of Philosophy*, p. 582.

ialism. Revolutionary doctrines were favored by them in all fields. Anarchist, socialist, and communist principles were scientifically explained and widely spread among the general public.⁹

Individualism was developed to an extreme by Max Stirner, a materialist Hegelian, the most extreme and thorough-going individualist in the history of philosophy. In his classic work *Der Einzige und sein Eigentum* (The Ego and His Own) he developed with logical consistency a system of individual egoism. Averse to all that was ideal, abstract, and universal, he wished to bring man back to his concrete actuality and actual concreteness, his ego. The most consistent thing for man to do, according to Stirner, was to strive after being the greatest egotist. "Mir geht nichts ueber Mich" (There is nothing above Me, to Me the "I" is first).

Reminding one of Stirner, but in reality going his own way, is Nietzsche, an appearance of a peculiar kind. The keynote of his writings is the "will to power". Nothing goes beyond power, everything must give way to it.

Socialism aimed at a reorganization of the social order on the basis of material progress. According to Saint-Simon, only property acquired through labor is true property. The system of hereditary right should be abolished, because it was the source of all unjust distribution of property. Fourier wanted to bring about the reorganization of society through a new philosophy. He taught there was no God. What has been called the Will of God was nothing but the universal attraction that permeates the whole universe and is the cause of all motion in it. In man it manifests itself through his passions. Man, therefore, should not restrict them, but give them free rein, for they are the source of his happiness. Proudhon, a furious enemy of religion, went to the extent of not only flatly denying all validity of the concept of God, but even identifying God with evil (*Dieu est le mal*). The denial of God is a pronounced element in the socialist systems. According to Marx and Engels, socialism becomes an inevitable outgrowth of capitalism, because the evo-

⁹Raeymaeker, *Introduction to Philosophy*. p. 147.

lution of the capitalist type of society generates problems which cannot be solved otherwise than by a transition to socialism.

Contrary to the rationalistic valuation of the human mind by Idealism, Positivism limited its cognitive capacity to the facts of experience and the relations of facts. The existence of any reality beyond the limits of observable facts escapes man. The knowable is the sensible. The task of philosophy, according to Positivism, is to find the general law underlying the facts as given in nature and history. Its method is induction which is based on observation. There is no place for Metaphysics in the positivist system. Positivist philosophy spread wide and far. The positivist wave that swept over Europe was thrown beyond the European boundaries. Positivist principles were applied to all domains of philosophy and science.

The next natural step in the line of development was that from Positivism to Materialism, the denial of the possibility of anything existing beyond matter. According to Feuerbach, man is what he eats. Religion is nothing but the consciousness of the dependence on the laws of nature. For Moleschott, the most extreme of the materialists, thinking is but a phosphorescent process of the brain. Vogt explained thinking by a secretion of the brain. All that is supra-sensible and spiritual is radically denied.

Such was the state of affairs from the standpoint of philosophy by the middle of the nineteenth century at which the development of philosophic thought arrived once it had abandoned the solid ground of the *philosophia perennis* and broken away from the living stream of tradition. "Bitter strifes. . . troubles that vex public and private life. . . a fruitful cause of" which "lies in this: that false conclusions concerning divine and human things, which originated in the schools of philosophy, have crept into all the orders of the State. . . ." ¹⁰ The des-

¹⁰Leo XIII, Encyclical Letter "Aeterni Patris," *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger Brothers, 1903), p. 35. "...Systems of philosophy multiplied beyond measure, and conclusions differing and clashing one with another arose about those matters even which are the most important in human knowledge. From a mass of conclusions men often come to wavering and doubt; and who knows not how easily the mind slips from doubt to error," and p. 9, 2.

perate state was indicated by the rise of a multitude of rival systems with contradicting principles and divergent tendencies; pure Spiritualism and crass Materialism, absolute Idealism and rude Realism (Stirner), radical Rationalism and Sensism, rationalist Dogmatism and Skepticism, Ontologism and Agnosticism, Pantheism and Atheism, Monism and Pluralism, romantic Optimism and Pessimism, Individualism and Collectivism.

In the presence of such a variety of conflicting currents and in view of the great confusion arising from the clash of rival doctrines, is it something to wonder at that distrust in contemporary philosophy was engendered? Since all those systems could not offer an adequate and satisfactory solution, while men, by force of their endowment, were "seeking ultimate, fixed foundations and standards for thought and action,"¹¹ what was more natural for the truth-seeking mind than to turn to the past?

3. THE STUDY OF HISTORY.

The failure of contemporary speculation directed the quest for a satisfactory synthesis to history. And history proved helpful by leading to and disclosing the goldmines of intellectual treasures in the writings of the Middle Ages. The achievements of the nineteenth century in historical studies are outstanding. The passionate love for the study of history was a heritage of that intellectual movement that in history goes by the name of Romanticism.¹² It was a movement that, after sporadically appearing at diverse times among different nations, came to be widely accepted throughout Europe at the close of the eighteenth century, especially in Germany, where it left its impress on all aspects of life. In opposition to the stress on reason during the period of Enlightenment, Romanticism reasserted the primacy of feeling, sentiment, and imagination. This, it is true, lent additional support to the individualism of Enlightenment but

¹¹B. W. Switalski, "The Spirit of the New Scholasticism," in Zyburá, *op. cit.*, p. 182.

¹²A. Bigelmair, "Romantik," in M. Buchberger, *Lexikon fuer Theologie und Kirche* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1935), VIII, p. 967. Cf. Dagobert D. Runes, *The Dictionary of Philosophy* (New York: Philosophical Library), p. 272.

caused also a leaning towards the non-rational (emotional) which culminated in the consciousness (feeling) of dependence on the Absolute, Infinite, Eternal, and fostered the glorification of movement, process of development, endless becoming. From the emphasis on eternal motion and becoming sprang an inexpressible longing for the distant, the unattainable, the infinite, and a predilection for the mysterious, miraculous, fantastic, strange, and sometimes grotesque. The feeling for, or sense of, the immense Universe, in which nature and spirit united, created a deep interest in nature, and the conception of its animation and symbolism. The romantic mentality tried to absorb everything into the self, and to comprise all particular sciences and departments of life into a single unity without any demarcation among them. The characteristic longing after the distant led to the past, and above all, to the Middle Ages whose uniform, synthetic world-view possessed special attraction. Its religious, cultural, social, political ideas regained life. This feature of Romanticism sharpened the sense for history and is the root of the love for history in the nineteenth century. Its influence soon bore fruits, first of all, in the field of general history, then also in philology, the history of literature and philosophy.¹³ The excellent work, the researches in the field of history of Scholastic philosophy on a scientifically unobjectionable basis according to historico-critical methods, and their influence upon the systematization of Scholastic philosophy, were already touched upon in the previous chapter.

The study of history received a new motive and impulse from Hegel's explanation of the philosophy of history; the succession of historical events came to be considered the intrinsically necessary development of the spirit.

In what, then, does the importance of history as a cause of the revival and development of Scholasticism consist? Historical research made it, with the progress of studies, more and

¹³Niebuhr, Leopold v. Ranke, I. F. Boehmer, J. Janssen, A. Schulte, brothers Schlegel, Goerres, W. v. Humboldt, brothers Grimm, Novalis, Brentano, Tieck, Trendelenburg, Zeller, Bonitz; F. R. de Chateaubriand, J. de Maistre, de Lamennais; Donoso Cortes (*El clasicismo y el romanticismo*) Martinez de la Rosa, A. R. de Lista y Aragon, Angel de Saavedra Duque de Rivas; Manzoni.

more clear that the conception of "the night of a thousand years" was unwarranted. They dispelled the disdainful prejudice against the Middle Ages as the "Dark Ages." The contempt for the Middle Ages, begun with the humanists, who regarded the centuries dividing them from the Greeks and Romans as a period of barbarism and depreciated all features of medieval civilization, had to give way to a growing admiration of the richness in literature, art, and thought brought to light by the assiduous efforts of the historians. People were made to "understand by slow degrees that there was no such thing as a medieval 'interlude', and that the sequence of thought was nowhere and no while interrupted." The historians "have shown that Scholasticism constitutes a movement of ideas as complex and as well worthy of attention as even the finest synthesis of antiquity. The thread of tradition extending from ancient to modern philosophy is now for all time reknotted."¹⁴ The change of minds was something like the experience of Goethe with regard to the Cathedral of Strasburg: "Brought up as I was among fault-finders with the Gothic architecture, I nourished my disinclination to the mostly overloaded and confused ornaments which by their arbitrariness, made a religious gloomy character most unpleasant; this indignation of mine grew stronger as I had come across only spiritless work of that kind in which one could perceive neither good proportions nor clear consistency. Here, however, I believed to see a new revelation since none of those faults appeared, rather their very opposites obtruded themselves upon me."¹⁵ The treasures of philosophic thought in the medieval writings aroused great astonishment and invited more intense study.

¹⁴M. De Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New*, pp. 5-7.

¹⁵*Dichtung und Wahrheit*, 2. Tl., 9.B: "Unter Tadlern der gothischen Baukunst aufgewachsen, naeherte (sic) ich meine Abneigung gegen die vielfach ueberladenen, verworrenen Zieraten, die durch ihre Willkuerlichkeit einen religios duesteren Charakter hoechst widerwaertig machten; ich bestaerkte mich in diesem Unwillen, da mir nur geistlose Werke dieser Art, an denen man weder gute Verhaeltnisse, noch eine reine Konsequenz gewahr wird, vors Gesicht gekommen waren. Hier aber glaube ich eine neue Offenbarung zu erblicken, indem mir jenes Tadelnswerte keineswegs erschien, sondern vielmehr das Gegentheil davon sich aufdrang. "Wolfgang v. Goethe, *Saemtliche Werke* (Leipzig-Wien: Verlagsanstalt fuer Literatur und Kunst, A. G.) Bd. 3, 1. pp. 270-71.

The copious works, especially the numerous manuscripts, made it possible to draw a historically true picture of the nature and aims of medieval Scholastic philosophy, afforded a deeper insight into the origin, development, and solution of Scholastic problems, the sense and coherence of Scholastic controversies.

According to Grabmann¹⁶ the "whole controversial literature, on one and the other side alike, is by no means mere pamphleteering; its character and setting is strictly scientific and objective. It was the aspiration and striving for the knowledge of the truth in difficult questions that gave the impulse of these polemical discussions."

The historical investigation of medieval Scholasticism taught men to discriminate in Scholastic thought between parts that contain perennially valid truths and convictions and aspects dependent on the conditions of time, the lasting content of truth and the changing opinions, its groundwork and leading propositions and the remote applications, the essential traits and accidental differences of individual representatives. The historical study of the course and laws of its development led to the realization that it embodied a "common property, the synthesis of Scholastic thought,"¹⁷ and manifold differences of schools and tendencies. It was precisely this discrimination between the various elements of Scholasticism that revealed the vitality, validity, and applicability to or "workability" for the present of its ground convictions. Martin Grabmann, in his essay just cited, pointed out that another significance of the historical researches lies in their having "cleared up the ways by which the writings of Aristotle came into Scholasticism, as well as the forms taken by the translation, utilization, and evaluation of the Stagirite," and in having thrown abundant light on the role of Platonism, Neo-Platonism, and Augustinianism in Scholasticism."¹⁸ Thus, for instance, the understanding of the content, the nature of the "Christian Aristotelianism of Albert the Great

¹⁶Martin Grabmann, "Nature and Problems of the New Scholasticism in the Light of History," in Zyburga, *op. cit.*, p. 143.

¹⁷*Ibid.*, p. 131.

¹⁸*Ibid.*, p. 133.

and particularly of St. Thomas Aquinas” became cleared, when the examination of manuscripts made it possible to compare and contrast it with the theologically disinterested interpretation of Aristotle by the Parisian Faculty of Arts.

The discovery and study of philosophical polemics and criticism, e.g., the Franciscan reaction against the Thomistic school, the Old Scholasticism (*Via Antiqua*) against Nominalism (*Via Moderna*), Durandus against Thomas, is highly valuable, “because it introduces us to the conflicts about individual problems, and shows us how controversy clarified points in question, brought out shortcomings and difficulties, and indicated new solutions. The knowledge of this polemic literature allows us to see the style and method by which Scholasticism handled individual problems.”¹⁹

4. THE STUDY OF ARISTOTLE.

Another considerable positive influence, besides that from the investigation of medieval authors, upon the restoration and development of Scholasticism came from the study of the works of Aristotle. Since Scholastic philosophy is based, above all, on the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle, it is but natural to expect that intensified occupation with, and improved knowledge of, Aristotle would arouse new interest in the system that rests on Aristotles’s thought. In fact, history proves that the flowering seasons of Scholasticism, especially Thomism, were preceded and accompanied by renewed studies of Aristotle.

When towards the end of the twelfth century a great intellectual activity suddenly set in which inaugurated the widespread philosophical revival of the first years of the thirteenth century and led to the culmination of the Golden Age of Scholasticism, one of its main causes was the new contact and better acquaintance with the whole of Aristotle’s works.

In the first decades of the thirteenth century new translations of Aristotle’s works were made and new texts found:²⁰

¹⁹*Ibid.*, p. 141.

translations into Latin from Arabic of works already known; first translations from Arabic of works not known until then, and first translations into Latin directly from Greek.

The Scotsman Michael Scot (d. before 1236) translated several works of Aristotle from Arabic into Latin, of which Albert the Great made extensive use. Herman the German, (d. 1272), Bishop of Astorga in Spain, made a first translation from the Arabic into Latin of Averrøes' Commentaries on the Nicomachean Ethics, the Rhetoric, and the Poetics.²¹

In the first years of the thirteenth century the physical and metaphysical works of Aristotle must have been brought to Europe from Constantinople.²²

Robert Grosseteste (d. 1253), first Chancellor of the University of Oxford, undertook the first version directly from the Greek of the whole Nicomachean Ethics. Bartholomew of Messina translated Aristotle's *Magna Moralia*. Upon request of different representatives of different professions, especially Thomas Aquinas, William of Moerbeke (d. 1286) undertook a partial translation of Aristotle's works, of various commentaries on various writings of Aristotle, and the revision of already existing translations.²³

The influence of the new translations of Aristotle's works is summed up in this passage by M. De Wulf:²⁴

The great works of Aristotle called attention to new problems; and furnished a rich doctrinal storehouse to all philosophies. In particular, the Scholastics derived therefrom a number of solutions which they sorted out, completed and corrected before incorporating them into their syntheses.

That the new acquaintance with Aristotle had a bearing on the development of Scholastic thought is also shown by the

²⁰M. de Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, I. pp. 237-50. Ueberweg, *op. cit.*, pp. 281 ff. Dominguez, *Historia de la Filosofia* (Santander: Administracion de "Sal Terrae," 1946), pp. 187-88.

²¹M. de Wulf, *op. cit.*, p. 238.

²²*Ibid.*, p. 239 and p. 248, note 1.

²³*Ibid.*, p. 243.

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 247.

following observation: The Scholastic representatives before Thomas knew Aristotelian literature and even incorporated a good deal of his thoughts into their systems. Their basic trend, however, or their prevailing characteristic remained Platonic-Augustinian. Quite different is the relation to Aristotle of the two most important Scholastics of the Middle Ages: Albert the Great and Thomas Aquinas. Also for them St. Augustine represented a grave authority. In the thought-world of St. Thomas, to use Grabmann's phrasing, the Augustinian element has not been dislodged by Aristotle.²⁵ But the dominant temper in the world of philosophical thought is Aristotelian. The Aristotelian setting of Thomistic philosophy comes to light above all in Metaphysics, the domains of epistemology, psychology, and philosophy of nature. It was Albert the Great who inaugurated the great work of incorporating into, and blending with Christian thought the philosophy of Aristotle after purifying it of its Arabic-Neo-Platonic elements. Thomas continued the work of his teacher to a degree of exemplary perfection and systematic unity.²⁶ If, with Aquinas, Aristotle plays a role very different from that with the early Scholastic commentators on the Boethian writing *De Trinitate* — the reason lies in Thomas' extraordinarily extended and deepened knowledge of Aristotle's writings, of which the early Scholastics knew only the logical ones.²⁷

The revival of Thomistic Scholasticism during the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries, or the "escolastica española," had one of its causes in the immediate and intense occupation with the works of Aristotle. For Spain, the author of the article on Aristotle in the *Enciclopedia Universal Illustrada* (Espasa) goes so far as to state:²⁸

²⁵Martin Grabmann, *op. cit.*, p. 138.

²⁶A. Stoeckl, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (Mainz: Kirchheim & Co., 1924), p. 183.

²⁷M. Grabmann, *Die Theologische Erkenntnis- und Einleitungslehre des heiligen Thomas von Aquin*, (Freiburg in der Schweiz: Paulusverlag, 1948), p. 28.

²⁸*Enciclopedia Universal Illustrada* (Barcelona: Hijos de J. Espasa), VI, p. 222.

En pocas naciones influyo tanto como en la nuestra la mentalidad potente de Aristoteles. Puedese decir que la historia del aristotelismo, entre nosotros, comprende la historia de la filosofía española.

In France, in 1474, after the condemnation of Nominalism by the Faculty of Arts, the University of Paris had urged, by a formal decree,²⁹ the return to the philosophy of Aristotle and his great commentators of the thirteenth century.

Menendez y Pelayo,³⁰ in his *Ciencia española*, divided the period of Aristotelian splendor in Spain into two epochs: the first comprises the fourteenth and fifteenth centuries; the second extends over the sixteenth and seventeenth centuries.

The Scholastics of the first epoch were classified by him as Scotists.³¹ Those of the first decades of the sixteenth century he classified as degenerate and recalcitrant³² and dismissed them with this characterization:³³

Casi todos los escolasticos verdaderamente barbaros citados en esta primera seccion, militaron en las falanges del nominalismo. Muchos de ellos (Enzinas, Dolz, Nukez Coronel, Las, Celaya, etc.), enseñaron en Paris con gran credito de filosofos, el cual totalmente vino a tierra el dia en que Luis Vives lanzo contra ellos su diatriba *In Pseudo-Dialecticos*.

Spanish Aristotelianism reached its highest point of development in the second half of the sixteenth century. Menendez y Pelayo arranged its representatives in the following groups: 1) Alexandrian, Hellenic or classical Aristotelianism, translators of and commentators on the works of Aristotle, with Juan Gines de Sepulveda, whose works all "respiran el mismo

²⁹Statuimus et edicimus quod praedicta Aristotelis doctrina eiusque commentatores (sic) Averrois, Alberti M., S. Thomae de Aquino, Aegidii de Roma, Alexandri de Halles, Scoti, Bonaventurae, aliorumque realium doctorum, quorum doctrina, ut dictum est, retroactis temporibus sana securaque comperta est tam in Artium facultatibus in praedicta universitate parisiensi; deinceps, more solito, legatur, doceatur, dogmatizetur, discatur et intimetur — Cited by Dominguez, op. cit., p. 458.

³⁰Menendez y Pelayo, *La Ciencia Española* (Buenos Aires: Emece Editores, S. A., 1947), III, pp. 157-74.

³¹*Ibid.*, pp. 157-58.

³²*Ibid.*, p. 159.

³³*Ibid.*, p. 160.

amor al peripatetismo puro, bebido en las fuentes griegas"; Juan de Vergara, Fr. Arcisio Gregorio, Gaspar Cardillo de Villalpando, Pedro Martinez de Brea, Pedro Juan Nuñez, Fr. Francisco Ruiz, Pedro Simon Abril, and others.³⁴

2) Scholastic Peripatetics:³⁵ a) The pure Thomistic School (Dominicans and some religious of other orders, especially Carmelites) with Domingo de Soto, Diego de Astudillo, Domingo Bañez, Diego Mas, Diego Ortiz, Tomas Mercado, Juan Martinez de Prado, Juan de Santo Tomas, Melchor Coronat, Francisco de Arauxo, and Fr. Antonio de la Madre de Dios; b) The modified Thomist School (Jesuit philosophy, Suarezianism) with Francisco de Toledo, Pedro de Fonseca, Francisco Suarez, Antonio Rubio, Manuel Goes, Francisco Alonso, Ignacio Francisco Peinado, and others; c) The Scotist School; d) Scholastics of orders other than Dominican, Jesuit, Franciscan, or belonging to no order: Pedro Ciruelo, Fr. Pedro de Oviedo, Fr. Alfonso Gutierrez, Fr. Jose Blanch, Miguel de Palacios, Cristobal Plaza de Fresneda, Fr. Pedro de Oña.

Preparatory to the restoration may be considered the commentaries of Francisco Silvestre (1474-1526) and Thomas de Vio (1469-1534), called Cajetan, who besides their commentarial studies on Thomas Aquinas explained different works of Aristotle.

Momentous work has been done in the commentaries brought forth in the universities of Salamanca, Alcala, and Coimbra where the Scholastic restoration started and which remained its centers. The commentators on Aristotle were represented in Salamanca by Domingo Soto, disciple and colleague of Francisco de Vitoria from whom the impulse came, and Domingo Bañez; in the university of Alcala, by Pedro Ciruelo and Gaspar Cardillo de Villalpando whose knowledge of Greek enabled him to directly use the original text; in Coimbra, by Francisco de Toledo, disciple of Domingo Soto; Pedro Fonseca, the "Aristotle of Spain,"³⁶ and several other Jesuits (Manuel Goes, Ma-

³⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 160-63.

³⁵*Ibid.*, p. 170.

³⁶Klimke, *Historia de la Filosofia* (Barcelona: Editorial Labor, S. A., 1947), p. 325.

gelliano, Baltasar Alvarez) who under his direction wrote a commentary on all the works of Aristotle, comprising the essence of all commentaries on Aristotle of the Scholastic tradition up to that time, and created a work, the *Commentarii Collegii Conimbricensis* or *Cursus Conimbricensium*, second to none of its kind.³⁷ Similarly the professors of Philosophy at Alcalá brought forth a commentary on Aristotle, the *Cursus Complutensis*, wherein they strictly followed Thomism, while the Discalced Carmelites at Salamanca produced a commentary of twenty volumes on Thomas Aquinas.³⁸ The *Ratio Studiorum* for the Society of Jesus directed its teachers of philosophy to follow closely and to explain thoroughly the text of Aristotle.³⁹

The foregoing data show that the centers of Aristotelian studies were also centers of Scholastic revival, and that the immediate occupation with the writings of Aristotle had a fostering influence on the development of Scholastic philosophy.

The same observation holds true of the last phase in the development of Scholastic philosophy, the Neo-Scholasticism of the last and the present centuries. Among the positive factors working for the loosening of the ground for the reception of Scholastic doctrines, the awakening of attention to, and arousing interest in, Scholastic thought in Germany, Bernhard Jansen sees "above all the rehabilitation of Plato and Aristotle."⁴⁰

About the middle of the nineteenth century there appeared: histories of Greek philosophy; numerous new editions, translations, and illustrations of individual as well as of the whole of Aristotle's writings; studies on Aristotle and attempts at philosophical constructions based on Aristotle. This historico-philological and philosophical occupation with Aristotle was at first mainly in the hands of Protestant non-Scholastics, but soon was taken up also by Catholics and representatives of Scholasticism.

³⁷B. Egger, "Orden und Kongregationen," in Joseph Scheuber, *Kirche und Reformation* (Bonn a. Rh.: Wahlband der Buchgemeinde, 1928), p. 145.

³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 163. Cf. Klimke, *op. cit.*, p. 325.

³⁹Jos. Stiglmayr, "Unterricht und Erziehung" in J. Scheuber, *op. cit.*, p. 398.

⁴⁰Bernhard Jansen, "The Neo-Scholastic Movement in Germany," in John S. Zybura, *op. cit.*, p. 250.

Eduard Zeller wrote *Die Philosophie der Griechen* (The Philosophy of the Greeks), a standard work which he published in 1844-52 in three volumes. Schwegler followed with his *Geschichte der griechischen Philosophie* (History of Greek Philosophy) in 1859.

The *Metaphysics* of Aristotle was edited and commented on in 1847/8 by Schwegler, edited and translated in 1848 by Bonitz who also wrote an *Index Aristotelicus* of the complete edition of Aristotle's works by the Berlin Academy of Sciences.⁴¹ The Prussian (or Berlin) Academy of Sciences published all writings of Aristotle with a translation in Latin in 1838-70. Starting in 1826 the *Collectio auctorum classicorum graecorum et latinorum* began to appear at Leipzig by Tauchnitz (120 vols.) and 1851, in Berlin-Leipzig, Teubner's *Bibliotheca scriptorum graecorum et romanorum*, a collection of more than 500 critically prepared volumes. In Louvain, the École Saint Thomas d'Aquin started, under the direction of A. Mansion, the collection *Aristote, Traductions et Études*. Editions of such extensive size indicated intensive occupation with the material edited.

In France, Barthélemy de Saint-Hilaire edited and translated into French these works of Aristotle: *Politics*, 1837; *Organon*, 1839-44; *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1857; *Physics*, 1862. These were preceded by Thurot's *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1832; Pierron and Zévort's *Metaphysics*; and Ravaisson's *Metaphysics*.

P. Vallet⁴² thought highly of the works of M. Barthélemy Saint-Hilaire and Ravaisson.

Studies on Aristotle appeared under the names of Chauver,

⁴¹Abundant bibliography of individual editions is given by Ueberweg, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (Berlin: E. S. Mittler & Sohn, 1926), I.

⁴²P. Vallet, *Histoire de la Philosophie* (Paris: A. Roger et F. Chernoviz, 1882), p. 632. He wrote: "Nemmons au premier rang M. Barthelemy Saint-Hilaire et M. Felix Ravaisson. Le premier a donné une traduction presque complete des oeuvres du Stagirite, précédée de longues dissertations historiques et critiques par manière de peface et accompagnée de notes perpetuelles. Cette traduction a rendu de grands services pour l'intelligence du texte aristotélicien, toujours laconique et parfois difficile a bien saisir."-p. 633; "L'ouvrage de M. Ravaisson est beaucoup plus restreint, son titre l'indique: *Essai sur la métaphysique d'Aristote*. Mais sous ce titre modeste se cache une analyse étendue de la *Métaphysique*, l'indication du plan suivi par lé philosophe grec, une étude interessante, sur la place qu'occupe la métaphysique dans la philosophie d'Aris'tote, enfin une histoire complète de la métaphysique avant et après Aristote."

Chaignet (Psychology); Janet, Denis, Leprune (Ethics); Vacherot, Ravaisson, J. Simon (Physics); Havet, Hauréau, Renan.

In England, Taylor translated the complete works of Aristotle into English (1812). George Henry Lewes wrote *Aristotle, A Chapter from the History of Science* (London, 1828) and *Aristotle* (1864), Ed. Wallace an *Outlines of the History of Aristotle* (1880).

In Germany, A. Trendelenburg, a sharp critic of the philosophies of Hegel and Herbart, followed Aristotle in his attempt to harmonize Idealism and Realism. His *Logical Studies and Natural Law on the Basis of Ethics* reflect Aristotelian influence.⁴³ Otto Willmann, Georg v. Hertling, disciples of Trendelenburg and Ueberweg, eminent representatives of Neo-Scholasticism, were greatly influenced by Trendelenburg.

While in the Middle Ages and during the Spanish revival of Scholasticism Aristotle's writings were analyzed and appraised independently of the personality of the author, modern thinkers see a great value in expounding the philosopher's thoughts in the light of their genesis and Aristotle's personality. Werner Jaeger traced the inner development of the Stagirite and the formation of his literary activity in his *Aristoteles, Grundlegung einer Geschichte seiner Entwicklung* (Aristotle, Foundations for — or Outlines of — a History of His Evolution) that appeared in two volumes in 1923.⁴⁴

The fruitful relation between the study of Aristotle and the advancement of Scholasticism is further demonstrated by the fact that in our times centers of Scholastic philosophy, like the Collegium Angelicum in Rome or the Institut Supérieur de Philosophie at Louvain, give special courses on Aristotelian philosophy. About Louvain L. Noël wrote:⁴⁵

(Msgr. Mercier's) collaborators and followers . . . endeavored to regain immediate contact with the thought of Aristotle, as it is found not only in St.

⁴³Stoeckl, *op. cit.*, p. 376.

⁴⁴Grabmann, *op. cit.*, p. 135. For a bibliography of studies on Aristotle, cf. Hans Meyer, *Geschichte der alten Philosophie* (Muenchen, Koesel & Pustet, 1923), pp. 266-382.

⁴⁵L. Noël, "The Neo-Scholastic Movement in French-speaking Countries," in Zyburá, *op. cit.*, pp. 236-37.

Thomas, but in the original Greek text; this they aimed to study with all the resources of philology, and at the same time with that philosophical understanding which is frequently absent in philologists and which an environment nourished by Scholastic thought can reach. Under the direction of Professor A. Mansion, the collection *Aristote, Traductions et Etudes*, seeks to attain this end. It is to include a French translation, with a commentary, of the works of Aristotle together with studies on the essential points of his teaching. This will also afford the opportunity of making a thorough study of the meaning of Scholastic notions by comparing them with their source.

The better acquaintance with the Greek language in our days, the great number of critical editions of all writings of Aristotle, the availability in a larger measure of Greek commentaries on Aristotle,⁴⁶ the numerous studies on Aristotle, "all that German, English, and French researches on the Stagirite have achieved during the last century, especially from the philological point of view, will have a valuable quickening effect on Neo-Scholastic philosophy."⁴⁷

Grabmann sees in the study of Aristotle this additional recommending factor:⁴⁸

The more intensive occupation with Aristotle as well as the contact with modern Aristotelian research has the further advantage of bringing Neo-Scholastic philosophy to move on a common terrain with present-day thinkers and scholars who are alive to the greatness and depth of the Aristotelian world of thought, but cannot as yet find their way to Scholasticism.

5. THE INFLUENCE OF THE POPES

The efforts of the different thinkers to bring Scholastic philosophy to new vigor was anxiously heeded, intensely and effectively supported by the Popes.

⁴⁶Thanks to the edition of the Berlin Academy of Sciences.

⁴⁷Grabmann, *op. cit.*, p. 135.

⁴⁸*Ibid.*, p. 136. Cf. the letter of J. H. Muirhead and that of S. Alexander, in Zyburra, *op. cit.*, pp. 77 and 79 respectively.

Pius IX missed no opportunity to do his part for the restoration of Scholastic thought. His exposition of the relation between reason and faith, in opposition to the teachings of the followers of Hermes;⁴⁹ his interpretation of the limits of reason and philosophy in the field of religion;⁵⁰ and condemnation of the rationalistic system of Guenther;⁵¹ the propositions contradictorily opposed to statements of D. Bonnetty, refuting Bonnetty's Traditionalism;⁵² the condemnation of Ontologism;⁵³ and the denunciation of the false liberty of science as advocated by Frohschammer;⁵⁴ of the modern Naturalism as applied to the social and political order;⁵⁵ were a forceful defense and unequivocal recommendation of Scholastic doctrine and method.⁵⁷

A still more lively interest and more active participation in the rehabilitation of Scholastic, and above all, Thomistic philosophy was shown by Leo XIII, who gave the Scholastic movement a decisive impulse. Immediately upon ascending the papal throne, Leo XIII urged the Catholic world to return to the philosophy of St. Thomas in which he himself had found the realization of his desire for a philosophy that would assure the harmony of life, reason and faith. In his very first encyclical *Inscrutabili*, 21 April 1878, he pointed to the Angelic Doctor as the norm of studies.⁵⁸

This being his "first and most cherished idea" that "the studious youth be furnished a generous and copious supply of crystal rills of wisdom flowing in a never-ending and fertilizing

⁴⁹Encycl. "Qui pluribus," 9. Nov. 1846. Cf. H. Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1932), nn. 1634-1639.

⁵⁰Brief "Eximiam Tuam" to Card. von Geissel, Archbishop of Cologne, 15 June 1857. Cf. Denzinger, *op. cit.*, n. 1656.

⁵¹*Ibid.*, n. 1655.

⁵²Allocut. "Singulari quadam," 9 Dec. 1854. Cf. Denzinger, *op. cit.*, nn. 1642-1648.

⁵³Decree of S. C. of the Index, 11 (15) June 1855. Cf. Denzinger, *op. cit.*, nn. 1649-1652.

⁵⁴Decree of S. C. of Office, 18 Sept. 1861. Cf. Denzinger, *op. cit.*, nn. 1659-1665.

⁵⁵Letter "Gravissimas inter" to the Archbishop of Munich-Freising, 11 Dec. 1862, and Letter "Tuas libenter" to the same addressee, 21 Dec. 1863. Cf. Denzinger, *op. cit.*, nn. 1666-1676, and nn. 1679-1684, respectively.

⁵⁶Encycl. "Quanta cura," 8 Dec. 1864. Cf. Denzinger *op. cit.*, nn. 1688-1699.

⁵⁷Cf. Denzinger nn. 1652 and 1680 which contain an explicit and positive vindication of the traditional method.

⁵⁸*The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII*, p. 17.

stream from the fountain-head of the Angelic Doctor;”⁵⁹ the rehabilitation of philosophy in the spirit of St. Thomas Aquinas as the foundation of an earnest view of life was one of his deepest concerns and made him, at the very beginning of his pontificate, write a special encyclical on the study of Scholastic, and especially, Thomistic philosophy: the encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, which appeared on August 4, 1879. This epochal encyclical was a summons “in all earnestness to restore the golden wisdom of St. Thomas, and to spread it far and wide for the defense and beauty of the Catholic Church, for the good of society, and for the advantage of all the sciences.”⁶⁰ The principles for the study of philosophy laid down in the encyclical reveal the Pope’s penetrating understanding of the nature of the existing problems, his farsightedness, admirable broadmindedness, and conciliatory spirit.

Since the errors of modern thought must be considered the main source of the evils afflicting contemporary society,⁶¹ a correction of these errors is commanded, by returning to a sound philosophy,⁶² which is best found in the works of the great medieval thinkers, and foremost in those of St. Thomas.⁶³ Their philosophy, therefore, should be studied, and should be studied from authentic sources:

But, lest the false for the true or the corrupt for the pure be drunk in, be ye watchful, that the doctrine of Thomas be drawn from his own fountains, or at least from those rivulets which derived from the very fount, have thus far flowed, according to the established agreement of learned men, pure and clear.”⁶⁴

However, when urging the return to the great thinkers of the Middle Ages, Leo XIII “did not wish the Thomistic doctrine to be merely disinterred and left in the passive state of an archaeological curiosity”; his aim was to have it become “the

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, p. 53.

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, p. 56.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, p. 35.

⁶²*Ibid.*, pp. 36 ff.

⁶³*Ibid.*, pp. 46 ff.

⁶⁴*Ibid.*, p. 56.

groundwork of a thought that was actual and living.”⁶⁵ Consequently, medieval theories should, whenever necessary, be modified or abandoned for scientifically established truth; a careful distinction should be made between what must be retained and what must be declared erroneous and obsolete: “For if anything is taken up with too great subtlety (*nimia subtilitate quaesitum*) by the Scholastic doctors, or too carelessly stated — if there be anything that ill agrees with the discoveries of a later age, or, in a word, improbable in whatever way, it does not enter into our mind to propose that for imitation to Our age.”⁶⁶

Scholasticism and Thomism should make contact with modern thought and science. The progress of the particular sciences, their methods and results, the problems of modern thought should be discussed, evaluated, and any real advance, no matter who be its author, worked into the assured heritage of thought. “We hold that every word of wisdom, every useful thing by whomsoever discovered or planned, ought to be received with a willing and grateful mind.”⁶⁷

Violence was done to the clearness of these broad principles, and injustice to the intention of Leo XIII when lack of understanding in some quarters misinterpreted them as imposing the obligation of slavish adherence to the letter of Thomistic teaching, or as a dogmatization of Thomism. The *History of the Popes* by Seppelt-Loeffler quotes Seeberg⁶⁸ asking: “What else does that mean than this — that the development of science should stand still, that the Middle Ages should have the last word in the knowledge of mankind?”

According to the conception of Leo XIII, Scholasticism should positively seek contact with modern science and thought. The perennially valid truths of Scholastic philosophy should be applied to modern problems; then new findings of modern sci-

⁶⁵L. Noël, *op. cit.*, p. 214. Cf. *The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII*, p. 49.

⁶⁶*Ibid.*, p. 56.

⁶⁷*Loc. cit.*

⁶⁸A protestant theologian and historian of dogmas (d. 1932). “Was anders heisst das, als dass die Entwicklung der Wissenschaft still stehen soll, als dass das Mittelalter das letzte Wort haben soll in der Erkenntnis der Menschheit?” (*Deutsche Monatsschrift* 6 (1904), 32), Franz Xaver Seppelt-Klemens Loeffler, *Papstgeschichte* (Muenchen: Koesel & Pustet, 1933), p. 473.

ence, the insights and conclusions of the intellectual labors of modern thinkers, if only they spell real advancement of truth, should be embodied in the traditional system. *Vetera novis augere et perficere*.

The real progress of the sciences would benefit philosophical speculation.

For when the Scholastics, following the opinion of the holy Fathers, always held in anthropology that the human intelligence is only led to the knowledge of things without body and matter by things sensible, they well understood that nothing was of greater use to the philosopher than diligently to search into the mysteries of nature and to be earnest and constant in the study of physical things. And this they confirmed by their own example; for St. Thomas, Blessed Albertus Magnus, and other leaders of the Scholastics were never so wholly rapt in the study of philosophy as not to give large attention to the knowledge of natural things.⁶⁹

Leo XIII showed his interest in the advancement of scientific studies at different occasions.⁷⁰ He elevated, in 1879, the scholars Zigliara, Hergenroether, and Newman to the dignity of the Cardinalate. By opening the Vatican Archives to researchers of all countries in 1883, he did an inestimable service to the historical sciences: Rome became a center of historical research. He facilitated the use of the Vatican Library, and created in the Bibliotheca Leonina a large and well arranged library for reference work. In 1891 he acquired the manuscripts of the Borghese library and in 1902 those of the Barberini. Cardinal Franz Ehrle and Henry Denifle, outstanding scholars in historical research, were called by him to Rome to preside over the library work. In 1879 he founded the Roman Academy of St. Thomas. Upon his initiative a chair of Thomistic philosophy was established at the university of Louvain, in 1882, and in 1888, upon his insistence, the Institut Supérieur de Philosophie was founded to which he contributed the sum of 150,000 francs.⁷¹ He encouraged and sup-

⁶⁹"Aeterni Patris," *The Great Encyclical Letters...*, pp. 55-56.

⁷⁰Jos. Card. Hergenroether, *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte* (Freiburg i. Br.: Herder, 1909), III, p. 390.

ported the Instituts catholiques in France, the university of Louvain, the new Catholic universities at Washington and Fribourg. Substantial support was lent to archeological studies and natural sciences. In 1886 the Academia dei Nuovi Lincei was reorganized; in 1891 the Vatican observatory renewed and enlarged.⁷² An academy for literature and literary criticism was founded. The plan of international congresses of Catholic scholars for the purpose of promoting Catholic science found his ready approval. The first international congress was prepared by M. d'Hulst and took place in Paris in 1888, April 8-13.⁷³ Under his auspices the Dominican Order began work on a new complete critical edition of all works of St. Thomas, the Editio Leonina.

Due to all these efforts of Leo XIII, a new fertile era of philosophical investigation began which continually grew in extension and constantly increased in intensity. He united and increased the small forces that up to then had been working rather separately. He must, then, be considered one of the major causes of the success of Neo-Scholasticism. Pius XI commented on this revival of Thomistic doctrine: "quod quidem illustris decessoris Nostri promeritum tanti est, ut, . . . si multa praeclara sapientissime ab eo constituta gestave non essent, ad immortalem Leonis gloriam hoc unum sufficeret."⁷⁴

Leo XIII's interest in the resurgence of Scholasticism lived on in his successors. It was the same spirit that prompted their declarations, the same aim they pursued.

Pius X, in his encyclical *Pascendi dominici gregis*, 8 Sept. 1907,⁷⁵ by clearly exposing and sharply criticizing the heresies of Modernism, set in relief the importance and value of Thomistic Metaphysics. In this encyclical as well as in the *Motu Proprio* "Doctoris Angelici," 29 June 1914, he energetically

⁷¹Fulton J. Sheen, *Philosophy of Religion* (New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1948), p. 68.

⁷²Seppelt-Loeffler, *op. cit.*, p. 473.

⁷³The following congresses were held at intervals of three years: 1888 (Paris), 1891 (Paris), 1894 (Brussels), 1897 (Fribourg), 1900 (Munich); in this last 3367 scholars took part. The plan for the next congress to be held at Rome did not materialize. — See Buchberger, *Lexikon fuer Theologie und Kirche*, Vol. IV, col. 360.

⁷⁴A. A. S., Vol. 15, p. 314.

⁷⁵Denzinger, *op. cit.*, nn. 2071-2109.

insisted upon the study of Thomistic philosophy to be pursued by teachers and students alike:

Ad studia quod attinet, volumus probeque mandamus ut philosophia scholastica studiorum sacrorum fundamentum ponatur. . . Quod rei caput est, philosophiam scholasticam quam sequendam praescribimus, eam praecipue intelligimus, quae a Sancto Thoma Aquinate est tradita : de qua quidquid a Decessore Nostro sancitum est, id omne vigere volumus et, qua opus sit, instauramus et confirmamus, stricteque ab universis servare iubemus.⁷⁶

For the principles of Thomistic philosophy contain all that the nobles among philosophers and princes among the doctors of the Church through reflection and argumentation have found concerning human knowledge, the nature of God and created things, the moral order, and the last end. For this reason they offer the best refutation of Materialism, Pantheism, Socialism, and the various errors of Modernism.⁷⁷

The twenty-four theses, formulated by the Congregation of Studies and published on 27 July 1914,⁷⁸ and its declaration concerning these theses as safe directive norms (*tutae normae directivae*);⁷⁹ the canons of Benedict XV;⁸⁰ the encyclical *Studiorum Ducem*; and the Apostolic Constitution "Deus scientiarum" of Pius XI renewed the emphasis on the study of Scholastic-Thomistic philosophy.

In the encyclical, Pius XI pointed to Thomas as the guide to truth: "Iis, quotquot nunc sunt in desiderio veritatis, *Ite ad Thomam* Nos dicimus."⁸¹ He confirmed all declarations of Leo XIII and Pius X regarding the study of Scholastic-Thomistic philosophy and added:

Iidem (in clericorum scholis maiorum disciplinarum magistri) vero sibi persuadeant tum se suo officio satisfacturos itemque expectationem Nostram expleturos esse, si eum Doctorem, scripta eius diu

⁷⁶Acta Apostolicae Sedis, Vol. VI, p. 336.

⁷⁷*Ibid.*, pp. 336-38.

⁷⁸A.A.S., Vol. VI, pp. 383-86.

⁷⁹A.A.S., Vol. VIII, p. 157.

⁸⁰Canon 589, 1 and Canon 1366, 2.

⁸¹A.A.S., Vol. XV, p. 323, 2.

multumque voluntando, adamare coeperint, amoris huius flagrantiam cum alumnis disciplinae suae, ipsum Doctorem interpretando communicent, idoneosque eos reddant ad simile studium in aliis excitandum.⁸²

The Apostolic Constitution prescribed for all ecclesiastical institutions of higher learning:

In *Facultate Philosophica* Philosophia scholastica tradatur, eaque ita ut auditores plena cohaerentique synthesi doctrinae ad methodum et principia S. Thomae Aquinatis instituantur. Ex hac autem doctrina diversa philosophorum systemata examinentur et diiudicentur.⁸³

The vast and many-sided erudition of Pius XI, his unremitting desire and indefatigable studies to remain in close touch with the pulse of scientific life in almost every branch of research, and his generous contributions to a multitude of scientific purposes gave his declarations and directives a power which carried their influence far beyond the limits of the world to which they were first and foremost directed, the Catholic schools.

Pope Pius XII in his Encyclical Letter *Humani generis* of August 12, 1950 restates the views of his predecessors and supports their intentions by a) warning against novelty, bold and audacious opinions and declaring as "clear errors and dangers of error"⁸⁴ systems which are at war with Scholastic philosophy, and b) positively advocating tenets essential to Scholastic philosophy.

a) Wrong are they who

(1) scorn and "shamelessly call" as "outmoded in form and rationalistic, as they say, in its method of thought" the philosophy received and honored by the Church,

(2) "say that this philosophy upholds the erroneous notion that there can be a metaphysic that is absolutely true; whereas

⁸²*Ibid.*, p. 323, 3.

⁸³A.A.S., Vol. 23, p. 253.

⁸⁴A.A.S., Vol. 42, p. 571. — (p. 14, n. 46). English translation is taken from the text published by The Paulist Press, New York; pages and paragraphs in parenthesis.

in fact, they say, reality, especially transcendent reality, cannot better be expressed than by disparate teachings, which mutually complete each other, although they are in a way mutually opposed."

(3) concede that "our traditional philosophy . . . can be . . . useful as a preparation for scholastic theology, a preparation quite in accord with medieval mentality;" but question that "this philosophy . . . offers a method of philosophizing suited to the needs of our modern culture."

(4) "extol other philosophies of all kinds ancient and modern, Oriental and Occidental, by which they seem to imply that any kind of philosophy or theory, with a few additions and corrections if need be, can be reconciled with Catholic dogma."⁸⁵

(5) uphold the

fictitious tenets of evolution which repudiate all that is absolute, firm and immutable, (and) have paved the way for the new erroneous philosophy (*aberranti philosophiae*) which, rivaling idealism, immanentism and pragmatism, has assumed the name of existentialism, since it concerns itself only with the existence of individual things and neglects all consideration of their immutable essences.

. . . also a certain historicism, which attributing value only to the events of man's life, overthrows the foundation of truth and absolute law in regard to philosophical speculations.⁸⁶

No Catholic can doubt how false this is, especially where there is question of those fictitious theories they call immanentism, or idealism, or materialism, whether historic or dialectic, or even existentialism, whether atheistic or simply the type that denies the validity of reason in the field of metaphysics.⁸⁷

- b) The Church highly regards human reason for it falls to reason to demonstrate with certainty the existence of God, personal and one, . . . to express properly the law which the Creator has imprinted in the hearts of men . . .

⁸⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 573-74. (p. 17, n. 56).

⁸⁶*Ibid.*, p. 563. (p. 4-5, nn. 6 & 7).

⁸⁷*Ibid.*, p. 574. (p. 17, n. 56).

But reason can perform these functions safely and well only when properly trained, that is, when imbued with that sound philosophy which has long been, as it were, a patrimony handed down by earlier Christian ages. . . fundamental tenets, which have been elaborated and defined little by little by men of great genius. For this philosophy, acknowledged and accepted by the Church, safeguards the genuine validity of human knowledge, the unshakable and metaphysical principles of sufficient reason, causality, and unchangeable truth.

. . . We may clothe our philosophy in a more convenient and richer dress, make it more vigorous with more effective terminology, divest it of certain scholastic aids found less useful, prudently enrich it with the progress of human mind, but never may we overthrow it or contaminate it with false principles or regard it as a great but obsolete relic. For truth and its philosophic expression cannot change from day to day, least of all where there is a question of the self-evident principles of the human mind.⁸⁸

The evidence of scholarship, eminence of character, broadness of interests, and alertness to existing problems gave the Popes of the last renaissance of Scholasticism an influence that made also the world outside the fold of the Catholic Church listen attentively and receive orientation. The spiritual weight of their scholarly endeavors gave momentum to the Scholastic movement.

6. TREND OF MODERN THOUGHT TOWARDS THE SCHOLASTIC POSITION.

Another reason which explains the success of Neo-Scholasticism is the fact that modern thought in various lines drifted in a direction where an understanding of, and drawing nearer to, the Scholastic position became possible. Modern thought made a turn from the subjective-idealist to the objective-real, with a reversal in the valuation and treatment of philosophical

⁸⁸*Ibid.*, pp. 571-72. (pp. 14-15; nn. 47-49).

questions, which made the modern thinkers more responsive to the Scholastic way of putting and solving problems. Maritain⁸⁹ observed:

As a legitimate reaction against the raging intellectual epidemic and against what has been termed "the poison of the intellect," there prevails everywhere, in minds and hearts alike, a general yearning, — the yearning for the *real*....

... in every quarter and in almost every country, the light is dawning and the imperious need of truth and absoluteness is asserting itself. It is *reality* that is wanted, that is to say, truth reached *through the channels of the intellect and the primacy of the spirit*. And this accounts for the eager and sympathetic movement of the metaphysical curiosity which we are witnessing.

A considerable enhancement of the standing of Scholasticism in non-Scholastic circles is connected with the names of Brentano and Husserl.

Franz Brentano (1838-1917), greatly influenced by Trendelenburg, who developed principles congenial to Scholasticism, engaged in the study of Aristotle and remained a lifelong and enthusiastic adherent and champion of the Aristotelian way of thinking. A decided opponent of Kantianism and averse to aprioristic speculation, he followed the Aristotelico-Scholastic thought in his own independent way, energetically defended against psychologism the independent value of Logic and thereby directly paved the way to Scholasticism. The Austrian school with Al. v. Meinong as leader had its origins in Brentano.⁹⁰

Edmund Husserl (1859-1938),⁹¹ founder of Phenomenology, for a time the most important tendency in Germany, created a sensation by his *Logische Untersuchungen* (Logical Investigations) wherein he energetically combated psychologism and strongly defended the absolute character of truth and a posi-

⁸⁹Maritain, *op. cit.*, p. 193

⁹⁰Dominguez, *op. cit.*, p. 424.

⁹¹Cf. the first-hand report on Husserl by Edith Stein, pupil of Husserl at Goettingen and assistant to Husserl at Freiburg, in: Teresia Renata de Spiritu Sancto, *Edith Stein* (Nuernberg: Glock und Lutz, 1948), pp. 22-63.

tion of Logic of its own. Husserl himself drew inspiration from Bolzano (1781-1848) who also, following the trend of Scholasticism and Leibniz, defended the value of Logic as independent of Psychology: the content of the thinking act is well to be distinguished from the act as a psychic fact; the content of a judgment is of timeless validity, the psychic act a contingent fact. Instructive is what Peter Wust (1884-1940)⁹², from personal contact with students of Husserl, wrote (April, 1934):

For some time she (Edith Stein) was assistant to Husserl and thereby gained a grasp of the life-work of this thinker who since the appearance of his *Logische Untersuchungen* aroused a revolution in the philosophy of the most recent period. From the very start there must have been hidden in the intention of that new philosophical trend something mysterious, a yearning back for the objective, the sanctity of being, the purity and chasteness of the things, the "things themselves." For, although with Husserl himself, the father of the new trend of thought, the modern curse of Subjectivism could not entirely be overcome, the object-mindedness, proper to the original intention of this school, urged on many of his students along the road to the things, the facts, being itself, nay, to the Habitus of the Catholic man, to whom nothing is more conformable than the eternally being measured (*Massnehmen*) of the knowing mind by the measuring (*massgebenden*), normative things. It is known how also Max Scheler one day was carried away under the influence of phenomenology to the Catholic conviction of objectivity and how then this thought entirely changed, at least for some time, this thinker always so prone towards the emotional.

In epistemology the theory of critical Realism⁹³ which defends the existence of a real world independent of man's knowledge gained attention. Human knowledge to some degree gets hold of this reality (Herman Lotze, Oswald Kuelpe). Our causal

⁹²Teresia Renata de Spiritu Sancto, *op. cit.*, p. 155.

⁹³Stoeckl, *op. cit.*, pp. 376 ff.

thinking leads us beyond our mind to a world of real things (Ed. v. Hartmann).

In psychology Vitalism is taking over the lead (O. Hertwig, Reinke, Driesch, Troeltsch),⁹⁴ the mind-body problem is discussed, attention is called to the existence of imageless spiritual acts in the life of the soul (Kuelpe).

Metaphysics which had come into discredit as a useless aprioristic speculation is recognized as necessary to unite the manifold data of experience into a systematic whole (Wilhelm Wundt, Friederich Paulsen, Rudolf Eucken).⁹⁵

What since the beginning of the twentieth century was working consciously or unconsciously, intellectually or voluntaristically in philosophy and the individual sciences, in professional theories, in collective consciousness and the spiritual attitude of the educated, has burst forth with elemental force in the postwar period; a sobering down as to one-sided specialism and as to historicism, a passionate yearning for a deeper world-view and more adequate religious and ethical conceptions, a retreat from Mechanism, Idealism, and Criticism, a movement toward realism, metaphysics, contemplation of the totality of things.⁹⁶

And this observation of a modern non-Scholastic, George Santayana, is worth nothing:⁹⁷

In technical philosophy, especially in England and America, there is a lively movement towards realism, both in the epistemological and in the logical sense of this term; so that the gibes about Scholastic trifling and quibbling have ceased, or have become a sign of ignorance.

The more or less pronounced subjective and relative character of the philosophical systems of the modern epoch did not, and could not, satisfy the mind's definitely incorruptible nature

⁹⁴Josephus Gredt, *Elementa Philosophiae Aristotelico-Thomisticae* (Friburgi: Herder, 1937), n. 436, 2. Cf. Max Ettliger, *Geschichte der Philosophie von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart*. Munchen 1924. p. 244 ff.

⁹⁵Stoeckl, *op. cit.*, pp. 397 ff. Cf. Max Ettliger, *op. cit.*, pp. 225 ff. and 267 ff.

⁹⁶Bernhard Jansen, *op. cit.*, p. 265.

⁹⁷John S. Zybura, *op. cit.*, p. 75.

which can acquiesce only in truth, since truth is its proper object. Now truth and reality are one. Hence, the philosophical movements that in their speculations abandoned the world of reality, and thereby deprived themselves of the objective measure of truth, could not explain reality and left a void in the mind.

7. THE RELIGIOUS TREND.

The intellectual discontent was, and naturally had to be, followed by a religious discontent which, too, on its part looked for a new religious orientation. This change in religious attitude of the last century found original expression and explanation in Peter Wust's⁹⁸ last address to his students which he wrote on his death bed:

“Metanoëite” — this is the cry that, since the days of Napoleon, ever louder resounds amidst the European Intelligentsia. “Metanoëite” — this cry keeps on throughout the nineteenth century and increases, in the twentieth century, to the thunders of the cannons of the two great wars. Upon retrospection of the past 150 years one is seized with ever greater astonishment, seeing, how, at first, a few minds, then, however, increasingly larger strata of the occidental Intelligentsia begin to scent the fact that the time without Christ, after all, did not bring that freedom which many a one had expected it to bring.

A certain unhappiness begins to announce itself in the features of this Intelligentsia; and what this unhappiness signifies is all comprehended in the deep word which Augustine, motivated entirely by his own experience, wrote down in his Confessions: “Jussisti enim, Deus, ut sibi ipse sit sua poena omnis inordinatus animus.” Thou hast ordered it, O God, that every unruly spirit be its own penalty.⁹⁹

⁹⁸Peter Wust, *Gestalten und Gedanken*. (Muenchen: Koesel & Pustet, 1950) pp. 264-65.

⁹⁹Confessions, 1, 12, 19. Wust does not quote any edition, but rather seems to quote from memory. All editions I found have the following text: “Jussisti enim et sic est, ut poena sua sibi sit omnis inordinatus spiritus.”

No other philosophy could meet the underground-longing for the right religious relation of man to God in a better manner than Scholasticism.

Catholic religious life, after it had been aroused from its slumber during the period of enlightenment, showed extensive growth and marked deepening during the nineteenth century.¹⁰⁰

The awakening of religious consciousness in general, and the growing vigor of Christian life in particular, were positive factors working for the reception of Scholasticism.

In this chapter the endeavor was made to point out the different factors and influences that by convergent action brought about the revival of Scholastic philosophy and fostered its development to its present position in the intellectual world of today. To these reasons, which are extrinsic, one more must be added, an intrinsic reason: the nature of Scholastic philosophy itself.

¹⁰⁰Marx, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte* (Trier: Paulinus-Druckerei, 1935), p. 846. Cf. Al. Baumgartner, *Geschichte der Weltliteratur* — Ergänzungsband zu I-IV (Freiburg: Herder, 1912), p. 311.

CHAPTER V

SCHOLASTICISM

The influence on the revival of Scholasticism of all the factors thus far considered would finally not have succeeded in bringing about that powerful movement if, after all, its philosophy did not possess those qualities which give the human mind in its search for ultimate answers the desired satisfaction and rest. The next step, therefore, leads to the question: What kind of philosophy is Neo-Scholasticism? Which solutions does it give the great problems which vex the human mind? Which are its characteristics, or simply, what is the nature of Neo-Scholasticism? But to investigate the nature of something is to define it.¹

In the initial chapter Neo-Scholasticism had been described, in a preliminary way, as the development of the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages and its application to modern problems. This description of Neo-Scholasticism presupposes and includes the definition of medieval Scholasticism. What, then, was the Scholasticism of the Middle Ages?

Historians of philosophy have defined medieval Scholasticism in many different ways.² Some of those definitions are merely nominal; others are real but extrinsic; still others are real and intrinsic, but insufficient.

The nominal definition gives an explanation of the meaning of the name which, as an arbitrary sign of the reality defined, has no intrinsic connection with it; hence, as such it cannot reveal the nature of the reality. Real but extrinsic definitions are based on the relations of the reality in question with other things; they lead us only to its relative and extrinsic aspects. They go, as it were, around the edifice and describe its facade instead of entering and seeing its interior. Definitions of this

¹Fr. Angel de Blas, "Nature of Logic", *Unitas*, XXIII (Julio-Septiembre, 1950), p. 513.

²See the classification of definitions by M. de Wulf in his *History of Medieval Philosophy*, 1952, I, pp. 5-17.

kind are vague and imperfect. However, since the knowledge of a thing in its entirety depends on them also and is completed by them, they may not be simply neglected. Such are all those definitions of Scholasticism which attempt to explain it by linking up its doctrines with the schools in which they were taught, the language used for their exposition, the methods of exposition followed, the time during which they flourished, and other factors, such as religion, theology, ancient philosophy, and medieval science. All such definitions contain a "soul of truth"³ but do not give a satisfactory answer to what Scholasticism is in itself, because they define "Scholastic philosophy by what is not philosophy."⁴ A definition that is to give a proper notion and understanding of a philosophical system must be based on its doctrine at the age of its maturity, indicate the problems it deals with, and the solution of these problems, considering these at the stage of their highest development.

It is not an easy matter to form an accurate idea of any philosophical system because as a system it constitutes a body of philosophical doctrines and as such a complexity. It is a much less easy matter to elaborate an accurate idea of Scholasticism because Scholasticism, far from being the meager product of a barren epoch, constitutes a vast body of doctrines, the predominant synthesis in the Middle Ages, "the thirteenth and fourteenth centuries in particular . . . an era of expansion and fruitfulness, in which there openly flourished the most varied philosophical systems, the offshoots of the mind of Plato and St. Augustine and the Fathers of the Church, as well as of Aristotelianism, which they made to bloom afresh."⁵

The name "Scholastic," after the manifold significations received from classic and patristic latinity, came, during the early Middle Ages, to be used in a professional sense for "the titular of any teaching office whether in an abbey school or in an episcopal school. The science imparted in those schools was called scholastic science or scholasticism, and had for its object either

³M. De Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New*, p. 88.

⁴*Ibid.*, p. 89.

⁵Card. Mercier, *The Origins of Contemporary Psychology* (London: R. & T. Washbourne, Lt., 1918), p. 321.

theology or the liberal arts — and amongst these, chiefly philosophy.”⁶

But the philosophy taught during that epoch was far from uniform or homogeneous. The intensive study of the philosophical works of the Middle Ages during the last decades has brought to light the fact that medieval philosophy was made up of numerous and divergent systems; that

...during the Middle Ages there flourished *manifold systems of philosophy*, some inter-related, others foreign to one another; and among these latter, many were involved in inevitable conflict by the assertion of contradictory principles. *Viewed in its totality*, the philosophical output of the Middle Ages may be compared to a chaos, a mosaic of systems: there is no *doctrinal* unity to be found in its productions.⁷

During the whole period prior to the thirteenth century, four different philosophical currents developed in absolute or relative independence, each pursuing a course of its own; Byzantine, Arabian, Jewish, and Western philosophy.

1. BYZANTINE PHILOSOPHY

It was at Byzantium that Greek philosophy finally took refuge after it had first been banished from Athens by a decree of Justinian in 529 which closed the Neo-Platonic Academy, and was later on driven out of Alexandria by the invasion of the Arabs in 640. Except for the time beginning with the Crusades and following the capture of Constantinople in 1204, the intellectual exchange of ideas between Byzantium and the West was only sporadic. The service which through this interchange Byzantium rendered to the West was incomparably greater than that which it received from the West. Ideas of the West reached By-

⁶M. De Wulf, *op. cit.*, pp. 13-14. Cf. Hergenroether-Kirsch, *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte* (Freiburg: Herder & Co., 1904), II, p. 494, note 1; and Ueberweg-Geyer, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1951), II, p. 143.

⁷M. De Wulf, *op. cit.*, pp. 37-38.

zantine philosophy by way of a few translations from Latin into Greek, mostly works of St. Thomas.⁸

At Byzantium philosophical activity during the Middle Ages concerned itself principally with commenting on Plato and Aristotle, some of the representatives siding with Plato, others with Aristotle.⁹ It developed slowly and irregularly.

Although Byzantium could gather the inheritance of the ancient wisdom in its own native tongue, yet the infiltration of Greek philosophy was less marked than in the Arabian civilization, where the Greek inheritance was soon incrustated with a large Arabian deposit. But withal, Byzantine philosophy is the product of a distinct civilization.¹⁰

2. ARABIAN PHILOSOPHY

The Arabs came into contact with Greek thought through the intervention of Syrian Christians. Pseudo-Aristotelian works; defective, obscure, and inaccurate Greco-Syrian translations, interpreted chiefly through the Greek commentators; forced texts which were obscure in the original contributed to a transformation and adulteration of Aristotelianism with Neo-Platonist elements which made the Arabian philosophy "a sort of Philosophic syncretism *sui generis*."¹¹

It was the complex product of a civilization with a religious and mystical basis, and in which very varied factors played a part. Besides the influence of Islamism, and of the conceptions universally held in the East as to the functions of a Light God, the principle of all things, we must also take into account Persian theories, and, from 850 onwards, the Indian doctrine of Nirvana. It was about this time that the Hellenic factor began to operate: Greek

⁸M. De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, II, pp. 159-160.

⁹Ueberweg-Geyer, *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie* (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1951), II, pp. 281-87.

¹⁰M. de Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New*, p. 42.

¹¹M. De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, 1926, II, p. 220. Cf. Frederick Copleston, *A History of Philosophy* (Westminster, MD: The Newman Press, 1950), II, pp. 186 ff.

philosophy came in to join together all this material of such diverse origin and spirit into its own systematic framework.¹²

Arabian philosophy includes the theory of emanation — principle of monism — and ecstasy; impersonality, separation from human individuals, and unicity of the human intellect for the whole race. Eternity of matter, either as an emanation from the supreme principle, in which case it gives the philosophy a monistic tendency and makes it pantheistic, or as an element distinct from the supreme principle and necessity of creation on the part of God are two other characteristic elements of this syncretism.

This Arab-Aristotelian philosophy did not, in many instances, harmonize with the doctrines of the Koran. In the question of conciliating philosophic thought with the doctrines of the Koran, the Arabian philosophers parted into two different camps: The Aristotelians and the strict adherents of the Koran.

The following of Aristotle sought a solution of the difficulty by maintaining, on the one hand, that the Koran also contained, though only in symbols, the teachings of philosophy, but claiming, on the other hand, that they were teaching only what was true on the ground of philosophy, the very contrary having to be held as true on the ground of belief. They were considered heretics by the orthodox.

Among the rigid adherents to the Koran, the Mutakallimun,¹³ a theologico-philosophical tendency, aimed at constructing a philosophical system on principles different from those of the Aristotelians, and at philosophically interpreting the doctrines of the Koran in the light of that system. In their effort

¹²M. De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, 1952, I, pp. 292-93. Cf. Ueberweg-Geyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 288-324.

¹³Cf. Etienne Gilson, *The Unity of Philosophical Experience* (New York: Charles Scribner's Son, 1950), p. 46.

¹⁴Frederick Copleston, in his *A History of Philosophy*, II, p. 190, calls Avicenna "the real creator of a Scholastic system in the Islamic world." I wonder what meaning the term "Scholastic" here has. If it is meant to stand for the doctrine of Scholasticism still to be defined, I do not see how Copleston could use this phrase, since Avicenna's theory of emanation tending towards Pantheism, and his doctrine of the necessity of creation on the part of God both as to fact and object of creation—as explained by Copleston, p. 192—are basic doctrines and irreconcilable with the tenets of Scholasticism.

to rationally explain the Koran they guarded against exceeding the limits of the orthodox belief, and, on that account, they represent the properly orthodox philosophers of Islam.

The mystical current of the Sufis, a more extreme phase of the theological reaction against rationalism, considered the Koran the only source of truth, the reading of which was to be supplemented by ecstatic contemplation.

The Arabian philosophy developed and flourished in its Eastern branch under the Abassides at the school of Bagdad with Alkindi, Alfarabi, Avicenna,¹⁴ and Algazel as representatives; in its Western branch under Morabethes in Spain with Cordoba as center and Averroes as its most famous exponent.

By his doctrine that God directly creates the intelligences and draws or educes the forms of material things from the potency of pure matter, Averroes avoided the emanation theory of the school of Bagdad and thus excluded real pantheism. But the philosophy of Averroes contains and stresses certain doctrines which are incompatible with Scholasticism. The opposition and contradiction of Averroes to Scholasticism affects these organic and fundamental theories: the Infinity of God, creation, human personality, personal immortality and responsibility. Besides the divergencies in fundamental questions, there were also differences of opinion on points of detail.

3. JEWISH PHILOSOPHY

Philosophy among the Jews of that period consists in "an adaptation of the doctrine of Judaism to Greek philosophy as transmitted by the Arabs."¹⁵ Elements of Platonism, Aristotelianism, Stoicism, and Oriental Thought were combined. Three different currents can be distinguished in it:

a) The Cabbala, a kind of Jewish gnosticism, mysticism, and theosophy, combining elements of the philosophy of Philo, Neo-Platonism, and later influences as revealed in the doctrine of emanation and intermediary beings between God and the

¹⁵M. De Wulf, *History of Medieval Philosophy*, 1926, I, p. 228.

world, and the real pre-existence and migration of the human soul. It was opposed to the current based on Aristotelian principles.

b) The powerful original system developed by Avencebrol or Avicebron which closely combined Aristotelian and Neo-Platonist elements of the philosophy of the Arabs. Fundamental ideas in Avicebron's system were the ideas of emanative and degenerate monism, universal hylomorphic composition in all beings inferior to God, and plurality of matters and forms in one and the same individual substance which determine its place in the system of emanations.

c) The Aristotelian current represented by Moses Maimonides,¹⁶ aimed principally at a scientific explanation and defense of the doctrines of Judaism on an Aristotelian foundation.

4. WESTERN PHILOSOPHY

The development of philosophic speculation in Western philosophy was not at all uniform. Far from being a single unified body of doctrines, Western philosophy resolves itself into manifold systems with basic tendencies which are irreconcilable.

There is the series of philosophers beginning with Scotus Erigena, "the father of antischolasticism,"¹⁷ who elaborated the first complete philosophical system in the Middle Ages, a complete synthesis of a metaphysical and psychological monism, and who had a considerable and enduring influence on the development of Western thought in the Middle Ages. According to M. De Wulf,¹⁸

the principal tendencies due to John Scotus Erigena are: (i) Pantheism and Monism. John Scotus affirms the community of being of God and creatures; he gives an evolutionistic sense to the Divine ideas; they are a stage in the formation of God's essence; he denies the individuality of substances. It is because of his pantheism that Erigena is an anti-

¹⁶Cf. Etienne Gilson, *op. cit.*, p. 39 ff.

¹⁷M. De Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New*, p. 20.

¹⁸*History of Medieval Philosophy*, 1926, I, p. 139.

Scholastic philosopher; the substantial distinction between God and contingent things, the distinction between Divine ideas and creatures existing outside God, and the individuality of every substance are fundamental principles of Scholasticism. Indeed, all the pantheists combated by the scholastics up to the thirteenth century appealed to John Scotus Eri-gena. Being a pantheist, *a fortiori* he was an exaggerated realist.

(ii) The second tendency is that of heterodox or pantheistic mysticism, which regards the disappearance of personality and the substantial identity of the soul with God as the terminus of the mystical life. We find the influence of Scotus in all the popular corruptions of mysticism."

In the twelfth century philosophical doctrines appeared which were opposed to and contradicted the fundamental principles of Scholasticism. The Cathari and Albigenses, appealing to Epicurus and Lucretius, taught psychological and moral materialism by their denial of the distinction between sensation and thought, and the denial of the spirituality and immortality of the soul. Their Manichean dualistic doctrine of the co-existence of God, the principle of good, and a principle of evil, which destroys the Divine Infinity, denied fundamental theories of Scholasticism. Also destructive of the Scholastic system was the thorough-going system of materialistic pantheism of David of Dinant who, according to St. Thomas, "stultissime posuit Deum esse materiam primam."¹⁹ Human personality, plurality of individual substances, substantial distinction between God and the world, elements so fundamental in Scholastic doctrine and so irreconcilably opposed to monism under any form, were compromised by the monistic tendency of the school of Chartres.

The thirteenth century witnessed the long drawn out struggle between the defenders of the Averroist system and the great champions of that doctrinal body which above all is identified with the name of Scholastic philosophy or Scholasticism.^{19(a)}

From this summary exposition of the different groups of philosophical currents of the Middle Ages it becomes apparent

¹⁹S. Thomas, I, q.3, a.8, c.

^{19(a)}Cf. Gallus Manser, *Das Wesen des Thomismus* (third edition; Freiburg i. Schweiz: Paulusverlag, 1949), pp. 140 ff.

that Scholastic philosophy cannot be identified with medieval philosophy.²⁰ Scholastic philosophy is only one of several medieval currents; it is true to say that Scholastic philosophy is a medieval philosophy, but not all medieval philosophy is Scholastic. Besides Scholastic philosophy there were various other currents of thought; yet Scholastic philosophy occupies by far the highest and dominant place. It is due to the intensive historical researches of the last decades that the position of those historians of philosophy who identified Scholastic philosophy with the philosophy of the Middle Ages is losing ground while the thesis that Scholastic philosophy "is not the whole of medieval philosophy, but the best part of it, that it represents the collective inheritance of the majority of the thinkers of the West, and it had to encounter fierce opposition throughout the centuries,"²¹ though still disputed,²² is gaining numerous adherents.

5. SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY

Scholastic philosophy, therefore, is the doctrinal synthesis common to the majority of the leading thinkers and other distinguished personalities in the West during the Middle Ages. These Scholastic philosophers stand out from the rest as a group well marked off by a remarkable unity of doctrine. With-

²⁰In the latest edition of his *History of Medieval Philosophy*, translated by Ernest C. Messenger and published by Thomas Nelson & Sons, London, 1952, M. De Wulf conforms himself to the general usage and identifies "medieval philosophy" with "scholastic philosophy." This change, however, does not affect his former view. "Conforming ourselves to the general usage, we now identify "scholastic philosophy" and medieval philosophy." The expression "scholastic" thus has once more a chronological meaning, designating any philosophy of the Middle Ages, and the antinomy between "scholastic" and "antischolastic" loses the doctrinal significance which we gave to it in preceding editions. The modification is verbal rather than real, and this will not be surprising if we remember that most of the discussions concerning the expression "scholastic" can be reduced to quarrels concerning words. The equivalence between "scholastic" and medieval does not modify the bearing of certain fundamental facts which we shall establish, notably the formidable opposition between the "communiter loquentes" and certain other philosophers who attacked such or such a doctrine of the scholastic patrimony." Pp. vii-viii.

²¹M. De Wulf, *op. cit.*, p. vi.

²²The *Philosophisches Woerterbuch*" edited by Walter Brugger, and published by Herder (Freiburg i. Br.) in 1949 enumerates the school of Chartres among the Scholastic schools. Cf. Ueberweg-Geyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 143-146, opposing de Wulf's view.

out losing originality they managed to hold in common a great number of fundamental theories, that is, theories which determine the character and structure of a system because concerned with the great basic problems common to all philosophies. To be sure, the raising and precise statement of the problems, their thorough discussion, the elaboration of their solutions, the arrangement of ideas and solutions into a complete and coherent system of philosophy with so perfect an expression as it appears in the thirteenth century with Alexander of Hales, Bonaventure, Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, and Duns Scotus, was not the work of one day nor the product of one man, but the fruit of centuries-long intellectual endeavor and struggle.²³ Thus this doctrinal system represents a great inheritance which has its roots in Greek philosophy. It arose out of Greek philosophy, especially Plato and Aristotle, was continued and developed through slowly progressive changes and additions by the Church Fathers, and led to perfection by the great master-thinkers of the thirteenth century, especially Albert the Great, who began the systematic combination and unification of Aristotelianism with the heritage of Plato-Augustin, and Thomas Aquinas, who completed it. Concisely and pointedly M. Grabmann says:²⁴

Scholastic philosophy is largely determined by the transmission of intellectual material, by the influx of new sources, by joint action of tradition and independent penetration of traditional treasures of thought. It is precisely in this continuity of life and inheritance, in this organic and progressive un-

²³Cf. Coffey, *Ontology*, p. 30: "That one philosophy is the system which, assimilating the wisdom of Plato, Aristotle and all the other greatest thinkers of the world, has been traditionally expounded in the Christian schools — the *Scholastic* system of philosophy. It has been elaborated by no one man, and is the original fruit of no one mind; unlike the philosophies of Kant or Hegel or Spencer or James or Comte or Bergson, it is not a 'one-man' philosophy. It cannot boast of the novelty or originality of the many eccentric and ephemeral 'systems' which have succeeded one another so rapidly in recent times in the world of intellectual fashion; but it has ever possessed the enduring novelty of the *truth*, which is ever ancient and ever new."

²⁴M. Grabmann, "Nature and Problems of the New Scholasticism in the Light of History," in Zyburá, p. 132.

foldment of previous fundamental doctrines of philosophy, that it manifests and proves itself as the *philosophia perennis*. Clemens Baeumker, . . . traced the historical line of this perennial philosophy in the following manner: 'That profound system of metaphysics, such as it was grounded by Plato and Aristotle, as it was fashioned in the Christian spirit by Patristic thought, as it was rounded off by Scholasticism, especially in the imperishable lucid form and logical elaboration given it in the light of first principles by St. Thomas Aquinas. . . .'^{24b}

It is this one definite synthesis, the most widespread, the most ably defended, and the best constructed, which Scholastic philosophy denotes. Under this name cannot be grouped conceptions which were animated by principles other than or irreconcilable with those of Scholasticism, and those systems, which declared war upon Scholasticism, and whose principal doctrines were its very antithesis. They must be styled non-Scholastic or anti-Scholastic respectively.

6. DOCTRINAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY

1. Scholasticism as a system or a specific body of doctrine is a pluralistic and not a monistic metaphysics.

The universe is made up of a plurality of individual realities. Whatever exists or can exist is a being centered upon itself, incommunicable, and distinct from all other individuals.

a) There is a substantial distinction between the first reality which is plenitude of being and absolute perfection, underived and unlimited, and derived realities which are finite and limited. Being is predicated of the former and the latter neither univocally nor equivocally, but analogically.

This substantial distinction between God, the first, absolute, and infinite being, and His creatures, derived, contingent, and limited beings, makes Scholasticism the sworn enemy of pantheism.

b) In the world of derived beings Scholasticism distinguishes in the individual existing things between substance and

^{24(a)}Cl. Baeumker, *Philosophische Welt und Lebensanschauung in Deutschland und der Katholizismus*, Freiburg: i. Br., 1918, I, p. 69.

accidents. The substance is the inmost reality in the individual, the subject, the primordial foundation which exists in itself and is self-sufficient, that is, needing no other thing in which to inhere; accident is a reality added to the substance and determining it, but so dependent on its substance that without the substance it can neither be conceived nor exist. The accidents manifest the substance; it is by means of these that we come to know the substance.

While the essential perfection of any one kind of substance (e.g., man) does not admit of degree, there is a hierarchical arrangement of kinds of substances according to specific degrees of perfection (inorganic, plant, animal, man, etc.).

c) Being presents itself not only in a static order but also in its dynamic aspects. Being in its change or becoming is explained in Scholastic philosophy by means of the central concepts of act and potency. The doctrine of act and potency may rightly be called the soul of Scholastic philosophy.²⁵ There seems, indeed, to be no other way to explain change and the more fundamental problem of the one and the many than by regarding reality as composed of act and potency.

According to Scholastic philosophy act and potency divide being in such a way that whatever exists is either pure act or a composition of act and potency. Act or actuality is any present perfection, any degree of being which really exists. Potency is capacity for perfection, the aptitude for receiving a degree of perfection. In itself, therefore, it is non-being and imperfection, but not nothing; it is something positive, essentially and necessarily ordered towards act.

A being passing from one state to another becomes what it was not. Before it became what it was not, it could be what it becomes. It was able to become what it is, it was capable to receive the being which it now has; it was in potency to what it is now in act; or it had in potency what it now has in act.

God alone is pure act; whatever exists besides God is composed of act and potency.

The concepts of act and potency were developed and applied to an extent as to become synonymous with determin-

²⁵Cf. Reginald Garrigou-Lagrange, *Reality* (St. Louis: Herder, 1950), p. 37 ff.

ing, completing, perfecting and determinable, perfectible; they affect all the compositions of changing being. In this general sense they passed beyond their original signification of a process of becoming in the strict sense of "fieri", and were used to explain all compositions, without exception, of all being that is contingent or limited in its reality. They underlie the distinction of substance and accident, essence and existence, matter and form. They pervade all the departments of philosophy and everywhere they express the same relation of the determinant and the determinable.

d) Scholastic philosophy recognizes not only accidental change, that is, change in the composition of substance and its supervening determinations, but also admits of substantial change whereby the corporeal substance — and only the corporeal substance — evolves by changing into another substantial being. Hence the Scholastic doctrine of the composition of corporeal substances of primary matter and substantial form, primary matter being the potential, determinable element, substantial form the actualizing, determining part. Matter is a passive, absolutely indetermined principle, an incomplete substance, of itself neither actually existing nor being a nothing, an element between actual being and non-being. The form is the principle of perfection, the source of activities, and the seat of natural inclinations directing them towards an end.

e) The correlative relation of potency and act is also found in the relation of essence, or that which makes a thing to be what it is, to existence, or that whereby an essence is in the order of actuality. Essence receives existence, the supreme determination. Essence is to existence, as potentiality to actuality.

The pluralistic nature of Scholastic philosophy manifests itself further in the real distinction between being and thought, or the order of being and the order of thought; between matter and mind; sensation and thought; the subject knowing and the object known; in the solution of the problem of the universals, and the doctrine of the nature and value of personality.

The solution of the problem of the universals is based both on the individuality of everything that exists and the spiritual

nature of the universals. In the order of actuality only individual things exist. Hence the essences that exist extramentally are necessarily individual. By its abstractive power, however, the human mind abstracts from the existing individual its concept of the essence which is universal. The abstract views of things which the concepts represent are derived from the individual things themselves. It is true that this kind of representation is inadequate, since it is abstract, that is, obtained by leaving out of consideration the particular way in which the real thing which is conceived exists outside the mind. But it is true and faithful as far as it goes, since there is nothing in the abstract concept which is not entirely verified in the concrete individual. "*Abstrahentium non est mendacium.*" Therefore the Scholastic conclusion: The universal exists formally only in the mind but it has its foundation in the things themselves. The extramental reality itself is individual, the universal form of its concept derives from the subjective work of the mind.

Scholastic philosophy exerted highest efforts in safeguarding the value of human personality. Each human individual is an autonomous being possessing his own body and his own individual soul which comes to existence through creation, is the substantial form of the body but capable of existence also without the body, and by this union with the body constitutes the human compound, man. He is endowed with faculties by means of which he puts forth activities of a higher order, viz., knowledge and volition. The human individual is master of his activities, is equal in nature to his fellowmen, endowed with the right to personal happiness, safeguarded against the encroachments of the State, and destined for a life of personal immortality.

2. The doctrine of the individuality of all existing things with the real distinction, in the world of composed being, between the substance, or the permanent reality existing in itself and not in another as in a subject of inhesion, and the accidents, or the powers of operation and accidental determinations which accommodate themselves to circumstances, makes Scholastic

metaphysics substantialist, and far removed from exaggerated relativism.

3. Its explanation of change and becoming in the contingent world by the act-potency theory together with its theory of causality characterizes it as moderate dynamism.

4. Its conception and interpretation of the universe (cosmos) is finalist. Before a being appears in its actual state, it is in potency to that state. Its actualization consists in its passage from potency to act. No being can give itself its actualization, or move itself to the passage from potency to act. It must receive it from outside, under the influence of some other being already in act. The principle exerting such an influence is called efficient cause.

But again, the efficient cause in order to exercise its action is attracted by some good towards which it tends and which is to be realized through that action. This attraction exerted on every efficient cause by some good to be obtained is final causality; the good is the final cause. St. Thomas²⁶ put it in this form: "As the influx of the efficient cause consists in its action, so the influx of the final cause consists in its being sought after and desired." Every being has its own end which constitutes its good and wherein its perfection consists; every being, therefore, is possessed of a natural tendency whereby its activity is directed towards the attainment of the perfection of its own nature. "By the form which gives it its specific perfection, everything in nature has an inclination to its own operations and to its own end which it reaches through these operations. Just as every thing is, such also are its operations and its tendency to what is suitable to itself."²⁷ It is this finality

²⁶St. Thomas, De Veritate, q. XII, a.2- Cf. S. Th., I-II, q.1, a.2: "Prima autem inter omnes causas est causa finalis. Cuius ratio est, quia materia non consequitur formam, nisi secundum quod movetur ab agente: nihil enim reducit se de potentia in actum. Agens autem non movet nisi ex intentione finis. Si enim agens non esset determinatum ad aliquem effectum, non magis ageret hoc quam illud; ad hoc ergo quod determinatum effectum producat, necesse est quod determinetur ad aliquid certum, quod habet rationem finis."

²⁷St. Thomas, C. G., IV, c. 19: "Res autem naturalis per formam, qua perficitur in sua specie, habet inclinationem in proprias operationes et proprium finem, quem per operationes consequitur: *quale enim est unumquodque, talia operatur* (cf. III Ethic., v. 17; 1114 a), et in sibi convenientia tendit." (Editio Marietti, 1946).

which explains why the specific activities of a being constantly recur, as, for instance, the intellect strives after the true, and the will after the good.

Besides intrinsic finality there is also extrinsic finality which consists in the realization of an end outside the being that realizes it, resulting from a coordination and subordination of particular ends.

Intrinsic and extrinsic finality alone explain the order and beauty of the universe, whose permanence and universality cannot be the outcome of chance but presuppose a design that calls ultimately for an intelligent First Cause.

5. Scholastic philosophy of God is creationist. Though the proper object of the human intellect is the quiddity of corporeal substance, and the human mind cannot, for that reason, have a proper knowledge of what is beyond corporeal being, yet it can have an analogical knowledge of it. God's existence can be concluded *a posteriori* from the existence of the contingent world. A changing, contingent, finite and imperfect world can have its sole sufficient reason in the existence of a being that is the cause of the change but not itself subject to change, the uncaused first cause, necessary, with no limitations whatsoever of its perfection, the first intellect which is the cause of the order in the universe.

God's metaphysical essence is, according to the scholastics, His aseity from which His attributes follow as so many corollaries, showing the manifold aspects of the Infinite in Whom this multiplicity of aspects does not affect His unity. In Him alone essence and existence are one, His essence is His existence, pure existence limited by nothing, because not received in a potency but subsistent. This subsistent existence in God is, as in every other being, individual; a conscious being Who knows and wills Himself, personal. There can, therefore, be no confusion of this transcendent individuality with any limited being which begins to exist by a decree of His free will. Finite beings are simply other than the Infinite, though absolutely dependent on Him.

Before finite contingent beings come into existence in time,

they exist in God's ideas who in His adequate knowledge of Himself knows finite possible essences as imitations of His Being, and even actual realities before and independently of their existence in the order of actuality.

After these divine ideas, the exemplary cause of the world, He draws out of nothing by His creative act those particular contingent beings which He, in absolute freedom, will decide to endow with existence. First finite beings could not come to existence except by creation. This creative power, whose formal object is the very substance of things, cannot be communicated to any being besides God; creation is the direct work of God.

Even after He has called contingent beings into existence He continues the exercise of His sovereign power over them by conserving the created beings in existence, cooperating with them in all their activities through His concursus, while at the same time respecting each one's proper nature, ruling them and taking care of them by His Providence.

Thus Scholastic natural theology harmonizes God's supreme sovereignty and dominion with true efficient causality of secondary causes.

6. In consistency with its finalist conception of things Scholastic philosophy developed an optimistic and moderately dogmatic epistemology which, from the criteriological point of view, is objectivist as opposed to subjectivist; from the genetic point of view, experimental as opposed to innate ideas and aprioristic conceptions; from the entitative point of view, spiritualist as opposed to sensitivist, since it proclaims a radical distinction between sensation and thought, intellectualist, since it lays stress on the supremacy of intellectual knowledge through abstractive reason. As a moderate realism it harmonizes the individuality of concrete extramental realities with the universality of their corresponding concepts.

All cognitive faculties are made to convey knowledge, though only intellectual knowledge is knowledge in the proper sense. Knowledge is "the union of the knowing subject with some object other than itself" wherein the knowing subject receives "the form of things other than itself, not as its own

form, but as they are the forms of these other things, these known objects,"²⁸ and hence becomes identical with the object known, not in an ontological identity, but ideal (cognitional) identity which leaves intact the ontological diversity of the knowing subject and the object known.²⁹ "Omnis cognitio fit secundum similitudinem cogniti in cognoscente."

Hence all knowledge is the product of the causal cooperation of two factors: the known object and the knowing subject. On the part of the knowing subject it is a vital act bringing about a change which takes place in conformity with the nature of the changing subject and perfects the subject. To the realization of this perfection the subject must be determined by the object according to the act-potency theory; of itself the cognitive faculty does not suffice for knowledge, because it is a passive faculty, that means, receptive before it is operative, needing a determination by something other than itself before it can exercise its own activity; hence, of itself it is devoid of knowledge. It receives the initial impulse from the solicitation by the object. To this action on it by the object it reacts and completes the knowing process.

In the act of knowledge, therefore, the knowing subject does not produce or create the object, but presupposes it and is measured by it as something existing prior to, and independently of, its cognitive act. The intramental existence which the known object obtains by its being known is really different from the extramental existence which it possesses in itself. "Cognitum est in cognoscente secundum modum cognoscentis."

Scholastic philosophy recognizes two fundamentally distinct types of knowledge: sensitive and intellectual knowledge, or sensation and thought. Sensation belongs to the sensible order, thought to the spiritual; thought is higher than sensation. While sensation is common to animal and man, thought is proper to man and gives him his superiority over the visible universe.

²⁸R. P. Philipps, *Modern Thomistic Philosophy* (Westminster, Md: The Newman Bookshop, 1934), I, pp. 212-13.

²⁹F. X. Maquart, *Elementa Philosophiae* (Paris: Andreas Blot, 1933), III, p. 249.

Sensation is concerned with the individual, concrete, corporeal. Each of the senses, internal as well as external, is intrinsically ordered to its own proper object; and when concerned with the proper object, the senses are infallible.

Different from this sense knowledge, which grasps the concrete and particular, is intellectual knowledge in which the object is abstract and universal, the quiddity of things. The intellect reaches the quiddity by abstraction, that is, by leaving out of consideration and stripping off the individualizing features that characterize the objects of the senses as presented in the phantasm. Due to its abstract nature the concept of the intellect can be referred to an indefinite multitude of individual things, or is universal. The intellect draws its concepts from the phantasm; hence the Scholastic theorem: "*Nihil est in intellectu quod prius non fuerit in sensu*," which asserts the sensible origin of our ideas, and the dependence of our intellectual knowledge on the senses. It also contains the reason why the scholastics taught that the proper and primary object of the human intellect is the quiddity of corporeal things. Due to the process of abstraction and universalization which is a privilege peculiar to man the intellect can know everything: its adequate object is being as such, to which the intellect can attain in all reality, possible as well as actual. The universality of the concepts does not detract from the truth-value of intellectual cognition, since the content of the universal concept has been abstracted from the sense-percepts which grasp the objective being of things.

By means of its reason, the capacity for discursive thinking, the human mind is able to go beyond the world of experience and ascend to the transcendent, the positively immaterial.

The cognitive side of man's psychic life is complemented by the appetitive whereby man is inclined to pursue what will perfect him, or is good for him. All desire presupposes a knowledge of the thing desired: the sensitive appetite manifests itself as the tendency of the organism towards a concrete corporeal object presented by the senses as a good; the rational appetite or will follows the presentation of good as such. Good is what

is contributive to the perfection of the subject. Since the particular things have only limited degrees of goodness they are good under some aspect and deficient or evil under another aspect. To desire such a thing is good under one aspect; not to desire it is good under another aspect. This gives the will the possibility to choose freely between the two alternatives, hence the will is free with regards to contingent good. Finalist determination and freedom appear well combined.

7. The free act of man is the human act *par excellence*; it alone can be moral or immoral. As every being, by nature, acts for a purpose, so man, too, acts in view of an end; but since man is endowed with reason and free will and consciousness he can control the end which he pursues. Only what his reason presents to him as good can be his end. None of the particular goods can arrest the tendency of the will, which strives after good as such. The true and ultimate end of man, therefore, must be what is all-good, that is, God. He alone can satisfy the specifically human aspirations and most elevated tendencies, those of the intellect and will; the intellect will come to rest in the intuition of the Subsistent Truth, and the will in the possession of the Absolute Good. The free act that tends towards the possession of God is morally good; that by which man turns away from Him is morally evil. Morality consists in the relation of the free act towards the last end.

Man is bound to will his last end, hence also the means necessary for the attainment of this end. This obligation has its foundation in man's very nature which manifests the natural law, which again is nothing else than the application to man of the eternal law ordering all things to their natural end and inclining them to conform to this order. Man is naturally inclined to the knowledge of the means leading to his end, which the Scholastics called the *synderesis*,³⁰ a special natural habit, which influences him in the formulation of the general princi-

³⁰S. Th., I. 2. 79, a.12: "Unde et principia operabilium nobis naturaliter indita, non pertinent ad specialem potentiam; sed ad specialem habitum naturalem, quem dicimus synderesim. Unde et synderesis dicitur instigare ad bonum, et murmurare de malo, inquantum per prima principia procedimus ad inveniendum, et iudicamus inventa."

ples, the standards of his moral life, which conscience applies to a particular case.

Scholastic ethics is clearly anti-determinist or libertarian with a genuine and moderate sense of optimism and eudaemonism.

The attainment of man's last end is worked out in a network of relations, domestic, civil and religious. Man's very nature directs him to life in community. The basis and end of social life is the moral and religious order. The community is because of the individual, hence it exists for the good of its members; it cannot restrict the exercise of those acts and activities without which the individual cannot attain his end. As to essential perfection all men are equal. The right to private property is grounded in natural law.

The family has priority of nature and hence of rights over the state, though it depends on the state for the full realization of its end. From the purpose of marriage it follows that it must be monogamous and indissoluble. The head of the family derives his authority from God.

The state is also a natural society. Political authority co-exists with individual social freedom, since both come from God and are subject to God's law. The main duty of the political power and authority is the maintenance of peace amongst the citizens, the promotion of the common good.

These are some of the fundamental characteristics and leading features of Scholastic philosophy which, however, should not be considered individually and separately but in their interrelation to each other. Taken separately they may be claimed also by other philosophies which are not Scholastic. In Scholasticism they all stand together in marvelous coherence and interdependence, interpenetrating the whole of problems and solutions and thus knitting them to a real system with intrinsic unity, in which everything hangs together, and keeping it safe from extremes. Indeed, its unity, its sense of measure and moderation, may be considered important factors in the attraction it exercised on the minds in the West and the tremendous expansion it took in the West. Because of these qualities it is the philosophy that is natural to the human mind.

7. SUMMARY DEFINITION

Summarily Scholastic philosophy may now be defined by a real and intrinsic, though not complete, definition as the philosophy of the majority of the Western thinkers of the Middle Ages which explains all reality in a pluralistic, not monistic sense, advocating a natural dualism of God, the purely actual Being, and creatures, which are composed of actuality and potentiality, substance and accidents, essence and existence, matter and form, excluding, however, the last composition from spiritual substances: a dualism of matter and mind, thought and thing, the subject knowing and the object known; defending a creationist and personalist philosophy of God; developing a metaphysics of the contingent which is a moderate dynamism and at the same time substantialist and individualist; giving the universe a moderately evolutionist and finalist interpretation, the human soul a spiritualist, not a materialist explanation; proclaiming an experimental, not aprioristic origin of human knowledge; an objectivist, not subjectivist value of its intellectual knowledge, and a moderate realism; expounding a libertarian, optimistic, and eudaemonistic ethics; a body of solutions, critically examined and metaphysically well grounded, and therefore so natural to the human mind with its radical disposition for metaphysical truths.

CHAPTER VI

NEO-SCHOLASTICISM

Scholastic philosophy reached the climax of its development in the second half of the thirteenth century. It received its fullest, most perfect, and most comprehensive expression in the system of St. Thomas Aquinas, the prince of the Scholastics and unequalled scientific organizer and systematizer, who accepted and gathered up the whole of human tradition, a vast and often divergent material, harmonized with the world of Christian thought the wisdom of the greatest Greek, Arab, and Jewish minds, and thus produced a system such as the history of sciences had never seen. His philosophy "presents the whole problem of Philosophy with a fullness which had never been attained to before and has never been reached since."¹ But the splendid intellectual treasure of the masters of thought of the thirteenth century was bequeathed to men who were not equal to the task of keeping philosophical speculation on the height to which the great masters had led it. The great majority of those who devoted themselves to philosophy during the fourteenth and the first half of the fifteenth centuries considered their duty done by joining one of the different schools and defending its ideas against others. This led to passionate quarrels between the schools, abuses of the Scholastic method in endless multiplications of distinctions and classifications, an excessive hair-splitting with simultaneous abandonment of the precise and sober language of the thirteenth century. This, and a widely prevalent ignorance of the real meaning and character of the Scholastic system reduced the authentic Scholasticism of the time of its full flowering to a degenerate semblance of the system which provoked the reproach and scorn of the Humanists, and attacks on all sides by new systems, the forerunners of the

¹E. Gilson, *The Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas* (St. Louis, Mo.: B. Herder Book Co., 1937), p. viii.

new philosophy, whose leaders were decided to entirely break with the past. Instead of capitalizing on the tremendous mental work of the preceding centuries and the rich intellectual material of past generations, and continuing the construction of the grandiose structure, the foundations of which the best constructive minds had laid, they believed they could disregard the entire past and start all anew. Due to this violent and flagrant breach of continuity with the past the new currents of thought with their divergent tendencies led to the disastrous confusion of modern thought.

The representatives of Neo-Scholasticism are convinced of the objective and absolute character of truth, which does not change with the changing conditions of the subjects who acquire possession of it. The truth of the time of Aristotle is still true today; and what was true at the time of St. Thomas will remain true for all periods of human history. Hence their claim that philosophy does not alter with each passing phase of history. Truth is an objective treasure, to the discovery and conquest of which the individual mind can and may contribute its little share. As parents bequeathe material fortunes to their children in order that with the fruits of their toil the children's own labor may become more productive, and this is done from generation to generation, so intellectual material, philosophical ideas are transmitted. Each epoch inherits from the preceding and bequeathes again to the succeeding epoch. The joint action of tradition and independent penetration of traditional material of thought, the organic and progressive unfoldment of previous fundamental doctrines together with the incorporation into them of new facts and experiences give philosophy constancy and unity. The same thought seems to have been proposed by Gilson:—

Their study^{2a} has wholly convinced me, not at all that to philosophize consists in repeating what they have said, but rather that no philosophical progress will ever be possible unless we first learn to know what they knew. The chaotic condition of con-

²E. Gilson, *God and Philosophy* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1941), pp. xiv-xv.

^{2a}i.e., of the Scholastics

temporary philosophy, with the ensuing moral, social, political, and pedagogical chaos, is not due to any lack of philosophical insight among modern thinkers; it simply follows from the fact that we have lost our way because we have lost the knowledge of some fundamental principles which, since they are true, are the only ones on which, today as well as in Plato's own day, any philosophical knowledge worthy of the name can possibly be established.

Recognizing the incontestable law of organic relationship between the doctrines of centuries, the modern scholastics reasonably take over from the medieval scholastics their common synthesis in order to transfer its philosophical content into modern intellectual life. Hence their name of modern *scholastics*, and the name of their philosophy, *Neo-Scholasticism*.

But when the modern scholastics, by their very name, proclaim the continuity of their philosophy with that of the Middle Ages, they do not want their transference of the philosophy of the medieval scholastics to be a mere resuscitation of a philosophy long since defunct, a mere repetition of the medieval doctrines in our times, but a renewal of medieval Scholasticism that is fruitful and effective for the problems of the present. What is regarded as perennial in the thought of the thirteenth century, and can serve, therefore, as the foundation and guidance for further development, the principles that animated the Scholasticism of the golden age are so to be reestablished and planted amid the controversies of the present as to offer solutions to the present problems peculiar to our epoch. Hence the renewal of medieval Scholasticism in our days is to be a further development, a progressive unfoldment of its fundamental doctrines implying addition to the common fund of doctrine. Hence the name of *neo-Scholasticism* to indicate that it is an adaptation to modern intellectual needs and conditions.³

³Cf. Mercier, *Logique*, Introd., par. 14: "Amid the almost uninterrupted disintegration of systems during the last three centuries, the philosophy of St. Thomas has alone been able to stand the shock of criticism; it alone has proved sufficiently solid and comprehensive to serve as an intellectual basis and unifying principle for all the new facts and phenomena brought to light by the modern sciences. And unless we are much mistaken, those who take up and follow this philosophy will come to think, as we do, that on the anal-

Wherein does the adaptation consist? Leo XIII had pointed out the direction, manner, and extent of this adaptation: Scholasticism should come in close contact with modern thought and science in order to receive "with a willing and grateful mind. . . every word of wisdom, every useful thing by whomsoever discovered or planned" and to give up "anything that ill agrees with the discoveries of a later age," or whatever is "improbable in whatever way."⁴

1. ELIMINATION OF FALSE NOTIONS.

Such theories as, for instance, in the physics of the Scholastics, the assumption of the greater perfection of stars and their superiority to substances on earth because of their special composition and nobler manner of motion, do not agree with the results of scientific progress. In the heavenly bodies primary matter and substantial form were believed to be inseparably

ysis of mental acts and processes, on the inner nature of corporeal things, of living things, and of man, on the existence and nature of God, on the foundation of speculative and moral science, none have thought or written more wisely than St. Thomas Aquinas. But though we place our programme and teaching under the patronage of the illustrious name of this prince of scholastics, we do not regard the Thomistic philosophy as an ideal beyond possibility of amelioration, or as a boundary to the activity of the human mind. We do think, however, on mature reflection, that we are acting no less wisely than modestly in taking it as our starting-point and constant standard of reference. This we say in answer to those of our friends and enemies who are occasionally pleased to ask us if we really do mean to lead back the modern mind into the Middle Ages, and to identify philosophy *simply* with the thought of any *one* philosopher. Manifestly, we mean nothing of the kind. Has not Leo XIII, the great initiator of the new scholastic movement, expressly warned us* to be mindful of the present: 'Edicimus libenti gratoque animo recipiendum esse quidquid sapienter dictum, quidquid utiliter fuerit a quopiam inventum atque excogitatum'?

St. Thomas himself would be the first to rebuke those who would follow his own philosophical opinions in all things against their own better judgment, and to remind them of what he wrote at the head of his *Summa*: that in philosophy, of all arguments that based on human authority is the weakest, 'locus ab auctoritate quae fundatur super ratione humana, est infirmissimus'.**

Again, therefore, let us assert that respect for tradition is not servility but mere elementary prudence. Respect for a doctrine of whose soundness and worth we are personally convinced is not fetishism; it is but a rational and rightful tribute to the dominion of Truth over Mind." *Encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, on philosophical studies. ***Summa Theologica*, I, q.I, a.8, ad.2. Quoted by P. Coffey, *Ontology*, p. 26.

⁴The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII, p. 56.

united, which rendered the stars naturally incorruptible⁵ or immune to substantial transformation, and explained their permanence. The nobler character of their motion derived from their circular motion, which was considered the most perfect of all motions, while the motion in a straight line of earthly bodies was an indication of their inferiority. Nobody will maintain today that the revolution of the stars in concentric spheres is brought about by extrinsic intelligent substances through mechanical contact.⁶ Equally superseded is the Scholastic theory of the four chemically simple substances (fire, air, water, and earth), their properties and functions in the structure of the universe.

The view on the generation of certain forms of life according to which the "sun, moon, and stars are a cause of life, as is especially evidenced in the case of animals generated from putrefaction, which receive life from the power of the sun and stars,"⁷ is, in the light of evidence of modern biological research, repudiated by all representatives of modern Scholasticism. Similarly there is nobody among the modern scholastics who would earnestly defend the explanation of the knowledge of external realities by means of diffused sensible species proceeding from the realities, traversing the medium between the realities and the senses, and finally entering into the sense organs.

Old problems that have agitated the minds of the medieval scholastics are not given the same attention and importance by the modern scholastics, as, for instance, the problem of the relation of nature to suppositum, essence to existence, the active and passive intellect, the principle of individuation, while other questions have moved into the center of interest, whence resulted the difference in amount of attention and efforts paid to the dif-

⁵The vegetative functions, e.g., could not be attributed to the heavenly bodies for such operations are incompatible with a body naturally incorruptible. "Manifestum est autem quod anima caelestis corporis non potest habere operationes nutritivae animae, quae sunt nutrire, augere et generare: huiusmodi enim operationes non competunt corpori incorruptibili per naturam." S. Th., I, q. 70, a.3.

⁶"Relinquitur ergo quod propter solam motionem" anima caelesti corpori uniatur. "Ad hoc autem quod moveat, non oportet quod uniatur ei ut forma; sed per contactum virtutis, sicut motor unitur mobili... substantiae spirituales uniuntur corporibus caelestibus ut motores mobilibus." *loc. cit.*

⁷"Sed sol et luna et alia luminaria sunt causae vitae: ut patet maxime in animalibus ex putrefactione generatis, quae virtute solis et stellarum vitam consequuntur." S. Th., I. q.79, a.3, obj.3.

ferent departments of philosophy and scientific research in general.

2. HISTORY OF PHILOSOPHY

The history of philosophy has gained an all-important role among the higher studies and become a department of its own. It was not altogether unknown in the Middle Ages; but it was completely subordinated to systematic philosophy; for the main motive for the cultivation of its study was different from that in modern Scholasticism. The medieval Scholastics cultivated it because it helped them to gather the deposit of truth contained in the writings of previous epochs, and, by way of contrast between their own teachings and those of opponents, to refute the anti-Scholastic views on the one hand, to confirm the Scholastic position on the other. The history of philosophy was for the medieval Scholastics a valuable instrument for making capital out of other people's ideas and meeting their errors. This aim of the Scholastics explains the want of exactness in registering historical data, a certain carelessness in connecting opinions with their real authors and attributing texts to the actual writers, and, in consequence, inaccuracy in quoting, which, however, cannot be said of Albert the Great and St. Thomas.⁸

Modern Scholastics feel bound to make full use of the critical methods which the rise of the historical spirit in the last century has developed for the scientific study of history. They do not aim at merely condensing the opinions of others into a syllogism in order to refute them with a phrase, or at putting whole systems into a few paragraphs in order to pass a sweeping judgment on them, but approach the historical field with a mentality that regards every human achievement as significant in itself. Hence the thoroughness in the study of ideas and systems in their relation to the life and temperament of the author, the historico-cultural and philosophical background, the actual conditions of their time and so on, in order to gain a genuine understanding of the thought of others and do justice to each

⁸Cf. O. Willmann, *Geschichte des Idealismus* (Braunschweig: Friederich Vieweg und Sohn, 1907), II, p. 330.

creation or product. This mentality, it is true, does not exclude the motive of the medieval Scholastics, but is complemented by it; hence it is that modern Scholastics are greatly concerned with the systems in vogue in their own days in order that by thorough acquaintance with them in contest and competition they may be enabled to sift the true from the false in their teachings, benefit by what is good in them, eventually correct their own weak points, and effectively prove the superiority of their own solutions derived from the great leading principles of the traditional system over the other systems in vogue.

3. SCIENCES

Scholastic philosophy is a realist philosophy; it wants to be an ultimate explanation of reality. True, it showed a marked leaning towards metaphysical speculation and gave the place of honor to the analytico-synthetic, speculativo-deductive method. But following the example of Aristotle who had himself a bent towards experimental science and conducted a systematic study of natural phenomena, and the example of the medieval Scholastics, the Neo-Scholastics base their speculations on the data of research.^{8a} They willingly accept the proved results of the sciences, since these results are both a starting point and the crucial test of the validity of their speculations. The willingness of the Neo-Scholastics to accept the proved results of the modern sciences as the groundwork of their speculation is best indicated by the participation of Neo-Scholastics themselves in the scientific work of today. In every field of investigation substantial and important contributions to present-day knowledge have been made by Neo-Scholastics and they have accepted the results of other investigators and interpreted them in terms of Scholastic philosophy.

...Neo-Scholasticism must follow up each avenue of investigation, since it undertakes, as Aristotle and Aquinas did, to provide a synthetic explanation of phenomena by referring them to their

^{8(a)} Cf. Joseph J. Harnett, "Desiré Joseph Mercier and the Neo-Scholastic Revival," *The New Scholasticism*, 18:316 ff.

ultimate causes and determining their place in the universal order of things; and this undertaking, if the synthesis is to be deep and comprehensive, presupposes a knowledge of the details furnished by each science. It is not possible to explain the world of phenomena while neglecting the phenomena that make up the world.⁹

The marching of Neo-Scholasticism with the modern experimental sciences, as far as real data or established facts are concerned, is one of the reasons why it is called the *new* Scholasticism. But while, on the one hand, the Neo-Scholastics accept the data of scientific research, they do not, on the other hand, surrender to that spirit of the modern sciences which would claim exclusive validity of the method of the experimental sciences and emancipate the experimental sciences from all dependence on philosophy.

That we have not bowed before the "idol of scientific method" nor gone over unreservedly to a mechanistic view of the universe will hardly be laid to our discredit. Present day philosophy is not at all convinced of the wisdom of the wholehearted surrender which nineteenth century philosophy made to mechanistic science. In fact, it has again and again repudiated this surrender and is working its way in a direction almost the very contrary to that pointed out by the science of the last century as the safe road to pursue. Again, it is only a reactionary view of science which condemns a philosophy because it refuses to succumb to the mechanical view of nature.¹⁰

In the different departments of philosophy Neo-Scholasticism encountered the attacks of entirely new and original tendencies creating problems unknown to the medieval Scholastics: Phenomenalism, positivism, criticism, and agnosticism declared war on the very principles of Scholastic philosophy.

⁹M. De Wulf, "Neo-Scholasticism," *The Catholic Encyclopedia* (New York: The Universal Knowledge Foundation, Inc., 1913), X, p. 747, Cf. P. Coffey, *op. cit.*, pp. 28, ff.

¹⁰James H. Ryan, "The New Scholasticism and its Contributions to Modern Thought," in Zyburia, *Present-Day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism*, p. 353. Cf. Mortimer J. Adler, "The Next Twenty-five Years in Philosophy," *The New Scholasticism*, 25:83 ff., Jan. 1951.

4. METAPHYSICS

While in the Middle Ages metaphysics was not only unchallenged in its validity, but also enjoyed the predilection of the medieval thinkers and played, as a department of first importance, the dominant role in thought, the panphenomenalism of Hume, the criticism of Kant, the positivism of Comte, and the agnosticism of Spencer denied to metaphysics its very possibility. Neo-Scholasticism not only had to refute the destructive claims of the new tendencies, but also had to show positively the legitimacy of metaphysics, establish its rights, and expound the true significance of its fundamental concepts and questions.

5. EPISTEMOLOGY

In epistemology modern philosophy has supplanted the traditional spontaneous trust in the natural capacity of the cognitive faculties by a critical-sceptic tendency which agitated the question whether at all the structure of our faculties would render an application of our knowledge to an extramental world possible. According to Descartes, there is in sensation no immediate contact of consciousness with the external world. Human consciousness is without any direct relation to realities foreign to the self. Its only contents are images of things; the images, not the things themselves, are the immediate object of the intellect. By introducing into modern thought the representationist conception of knowledge, Descartes gives the critical problem a new form. Up to then the existence of an extramental world was unanimously admitted; the implicit critical problem was concerned with the question whether and how far our universal ideas reached the extramental world, or in other words, the critical problem was concerned with the objective value of our intellectual knowledge. Under the statement of the problem in the form which Descartes gave it the existence of extramental reality had to be proved.

Kant, desirous to end once and for all the "dogmatic slumber" of reason, and to find out the conditions of human knowl-

edge, stated the critical problem in so peremptory a way that it has become the problem *par excellence* of contemporary philosophy. His solution of it was a Copernican revolution in the realm of thought, which completely upset the traditional notion of knowledge, and put at stake the whole Scholastic system. Neo-Scholasticism had to face these problems and take up new positions without abandoning the old ones. The study of every detail of these revolutionary solutions and their criticism naturally also led to an adaptation of method. While the ancient scholastics handled the problem of truth and certitude from the deductive point of view, present-day Scholastics prefer an inductive solution proceeding by introspection and analysis of the cognitional data. Thus epistemology became an almost altogether new epistemology.

6. NATURAL THEOLOGY

The natural theology of Neo-Scholasticism is not at all a mere repetition of medieval natural theology. Materialism, positivism, and phenomenalism, reducing everything to matter, facts, or appearances, and admitting sensation as the only source of knowledge, logically must deny a Supreme Being different from the material universe which is for them, in the terms of Comte, a mere chimera. Kantianism and agnosticism do not deny the existence of God, but banish Him beyond the boundaries of what the human mind can reach: God is simply unknowable. Against such positions in contemporary thought Neo-Scholasticism had to show that, in a very real sense, God is not unknowable, but well within the reach of the human intellect.

It had further to defend the traditional proofs of the existence of God which retain their demonstrative power even in the light of the critique which Kant had thrown at them, and to refute the charges which Herbert Spencer had preferred against them. To break the power of the new weapons, effectively bring its solutions of the objections and problems to the attention of contemporary minds, and thus prove its own vital

strength, it was not enough to simply reproduce the arguments of old, but necessary to thoroughly examine the assaults of the new adverse tendencies and formulate its own arguments in a manner appealing to the mental attitude of this epoch.

It enlarged on the chapter on the concept and existence of God by making use of the large material gathered by ethnography or ethnology and the history of religions, and devoted additional attention to the same question, though from another point of view, in the field of the Philosophy of Religion which, since the first half of the last century, developed as a new branch and is now given more and more importance.

Deism divorced God from the universe and allowed Him no concern with the fortunes of men. Neo-Scholasticism had to vindicate and uphold the concept of the providential rule of the world by an all-wise and all-good God.

Monism and pantheism assumed some novel and attractive features in post-Hegelian philosophy, and gained tremendous influence. Never before had monism appeared in so many forms. Yet there is one thing all its varieties have in common: they obliterate the distinction of the universe from God, and substitute the transcendent and personal God with an immanent and impersonal deity.

In the clash with the exuberantly fanciful and wild conceptions of the Divinity in modern philosophy, Neo-Scholasticism is called upon to give, by an application of the sober and sound views of the medieval masters, a fully effective answer.

7. PHILOSOPHY OF NATURE

In the sphere of philosophy of nature, with the substitution of so much of the old Physics by the results of the speedily progressing modern sciences, it is the task of Neo-Scholasticism to offer a philosophical explanation of the conquests of modern sciences by means of the essential principles of Scholasticism. It undertook this toilsome study by carefully examining the various departments of physical science at the latest phase of its development, and now can propose the conclusion that the new phenomena may well be interpreted in the light

of the old principles; nay, that none of the present-day hypotheses can compare with the Scholastic interpretation of the facts of physical nature. Scholastic hylomorphism, much ridiculed as it was, can, therefore, with the weight of scientific authorities behind it, insist on being more satisfactory than atomism and dynamism. The Cosmology of D. Nys may be cited here as an example of such study. He took special pains to remain in constant touch with all the changes in the sciences, but retained throughout his fundamental position that of all the systems the Aristotelian-Thomistic best accords with the data of scientific experiment as well as everyday experience.

8. PSYCHOLOGY

It is especially in psychology that the adaptive and progressive spirit of Neo-Scholasticism makes itself distinctly felt; Neo-Scholastics herein but carry on the tradition of Scholasticism. In the psychological sphere, the great medieval masters always were in close touch with experience. Their works abound in excellent psychological analyses and betray a marvelous exactness of observation of the psychic phenomena. All theories on the nature of the soul are based on the exact observation of the activities of the soul, especially the phenomena of sense, intellect, and will.

The Aristotelian and Scholastic anthropology founds its rational portion upon its experimental portion; it infers from the scientifically observed facts and facts of consciousness, the nature and, ultimately, the origin and destiny of man. The application of the principle of sufficient reason to the various data of consciousness and of outward observation leads first to the distinction of the faculties, then to the composite nature of man which is their first principle.¹¹

The experimental tradition of the Scholastics in psychological matters received a new impulse and backing from posi-

¹¹Card. Mercier, *The Origins of Contemporary Psychology* (London: R. & T. Washington, Ltd, 1918), p. 341.

tivism, which must be credited with having taught contemporary philosophy to pay the most scrupulous attention to all facts. The outcome of this is an emphatic inculcation of the importance of observation, internal as well as external, which has received its fullest application in psychology, where experimental methods of procedure are employed in the investigation of conscious and subconscious states, in the study of the physiological element, especially the structure and functions of the nervous system, in the whole field of sensational and emotional life.

Availing itself of the valuable material which the diverse experimental branches of psychology have accumulated, Neo-Scholasticism proceeds far beyond them in giving a systematic interpretation of the observed phenomena. Herein again Neo-Scholasticism finds that the broad leading principles of the medieval synthesis prove capable of interpreting even the latest findings in connection with psychic states and acts. Modern scientific analysis confirms the traditional Scholastic teachings.

Against sensism and empiricism on the one hand, and exaggerated spiritualism on the other hand, Neo-Scholasticism sees itself face to face with the necessity of clearly distinguishing the sensitive from the intellectual, and of firmly insisting on their distinction. The intellectual phenomena serve its arguments in vindication of the simplicity of the human soul, which is denied by materialism. The sensitive bridges the gap between the purely spiritual and the purely material, gives the necessary foundation for the whole Scholastic ideology (ideogenesis), and offers a natural explanation of the knowledge of extramental corporeal being. The presence in man of both the sensitive-organic and the intellectual-spiritual is, in the light of the clear testimony of consciousness, undeniable. The problem of explaining their mutual relationship in the concrete individual has by no theory been so satisfactorily solved as by the Scholastic theory of the substantial union of body and soul. Indeed, the phenomena of the interdependence of the sensitive and the rational activities and states in man, as attested by consciousness, find a simple and adequate explanation only in the Scholastic theory on the constitution of the composite nature of man, according to which

the spiritual soul is the substantial form of the material body. *Agere sequitur esse*, hence the functional unity presupposes an entitative unity; and in turn, a substance that is both corporeal and spiritual will be the source of both organic and immaterial activities. Occasionalism, the theory of pre-established harmony, the theory of psycho-physical parallelism, the double-aspect theory, the theory of actuality, were all a challenge for the new Scholasticism and an incitement to further study of the intricate problem.

A study of the development of the Scholastic principles and their application, in our days, to problems of individual moral conduct, of social and political life, right and duty, natural and positive law, the law of nations, private property and common welfare, communism and private ownership, beauty and value, and a host of other questions, born of the spirit of our time, will confirm what has been stated in the preceding pages: That Neo-Scholasticism, far from being a system that is dead, has aims, methods, and problems as modern as those of any other philosophy. It really is a restatement in our own days of the *philosophia perennis* which has been given so perfect an expression in the scholastic synthesis of the thirteenth century and possesses so much vital elasticity as to offer solutions to the most modern problems.¹²

¹²Cf. for the whole chapter the essays of Grabmann, Paul Gény, W. Switalski, R. Kremer, L. Noel, B. Jansen, F. X. Miller, and James H. Ryan in Zybura, *Present-Day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism*, pp. 129-368. — Friedrich Meisel, ed., "Das Loewener Institut als Verpflichtung fuer den Thomismus von heute," *Orbis Catholicus*, (Herder-Korrespondenz), 5:274-277, Maerz, 1952.

CHAPTER VII

LEO XIII AND NEO-SCHOLASTICISM

The preceding chapters have tried to answer the question "What is Neo-Scholasticism?" by pointing out its historical origin and development and outlining the most general but intrinsic characteristics of its doctrine.

The previous chapter endeavored to show, by a summary proof, the right of this movement to the claim of being a NEO-Scholasticism. It is not a mere revival in our time of the Scholasticism of the thirteenth century without reference to the problems and conditions of our time, but a restatement of the Scholastic principles in full consideration of the advances made in all departments of knowledge; a study and solution of modern problems in the light of the fundamental Scholastic tenets; a system which, while identical with the Scholasticism of the thirteenth century as to basic principles, has developed and grown beyond the limits of the old Scholasticism by absorbing into its system all that sound philosophic thought has brought to light up to the present day. The new Scholasticism is, therefore, more extensive than the old, being a development and growth of its doctrine, *vetera novis aucta*.

There remains the third question, stated in the Introduction (p. IV): Did Leo XIII intend to promote the revival of Scholasticism in general, therefore, Neo-Scholasticism in its broad current as outlined in the preceding chapters, or did he wish a revival of Thomism in the strict sense of the term?

It was already stated that Scholastic philosophy is not identical with medieval philosophy; that it was, however, the most widespread and most powerful of the different philosophical currents during the Middle Ages. It represents the collective inheritance of the majority of the thinkers of the West and constitutes a synthesis common to the leading doctors of the West, among whom may be mentioned Anselm of Canter-

bury, Alexander of Hales, Albert the Great, Thomas Aquinas, Bonaventure, Duns Scotus, and other distinguished personalities. These philosophers show very pronounced resemblances in their thinking, being in agreement on a considerable number of fundamental questions to such an extent that, as M. de Wulf¹ says, "their respective syntheses may well be considered as so many species of one and the same genus: scholasticism." But this unanimous agreement in the solution of vital, essential problems "does not prevent shades of difference, variety in development, and diversity of interpretation: therein lie the differences between the syntheses of an Alexander of Hales, a Bonaventure, a Thomas Aquinas, a Duns Scotus, a William of Occam."²

Scholasticism received its fullest, most perfect, and most comprehensive expression in the synthesis of St. Thomas Aquinas, the prince of the Scholastics (p. 187), who stands at the summit of the golden age of Scholasticism.

While, therefore, on the one hand, Thomas agrees with the other Scholastics on all the fundamental theses of philosophy, he, on the other hand, separates from them on a whole crowd of questions that were relatively secondary but yet sufficient in number and importance to give to his Scholasticism quite a characteristic impress. A few instances may suffice to justify this assertion.

To plurality of forms in the individual substance Thomas opposed unity of substantial principle: "Nihil est simpliciter unum, nisi per formam unam per quam habet res esse."³ This solution ran counter to the teaching of Alexander of Hales, Bonaventure, even Albert the Great, Duns Scotus and the Franciscan school in general.

To the hylomorphic composition of spiritual substances (angels) defended by the Franciscan school, Thomas opposed his doctrine of subsisting forms.⁴

As regards the principle of individuation, St. Bonaventure found it in the combined action of both constitutive principles,

¹M. de Wulf, *Scholasticism Old and New*, p. 97.

²*Ibid.*, p. 48. Cf. Cardinal Franz Ehrle, "Die Encyclica Aeterni Patris", *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, XVIII (1880), pp. 292-317.

³S. Th. I, q. 76, a 3, c.

⁴S. Th. I, q. 50, a 2.

matter and form. Thomas explained that the individuating principle is found in matter only; however, not matter in a state of absolute indetermination. It is the *materia signata*, quantitative dimension,⁵ "that is to say, the primary matter endowed with an intrinsic aptitude to occupy a definite portion of space." For St. Thomas, therefore, the question of individuation confines itself to the world of corporeal things. In the hierarchy of separated (subsisting) forms each individual constitutes his own species. Duns Scotus takes "thisness" - "haecceitas" as the principle of individuation.

Hotly debated in the thirteenth century was the question regarding the distinction between a substance and its powers or faculties of action. "Can action proceed directly from the substance in contingent beings, or do these act through the medium of faculties?"⁶ To the Augustinian theory of the identity of the soul and its faculties Thomas opposed that of their real distinction so that the actual operation as such is a determination which affects the substance only through the intermediary faculty, "*quia operatio est actus secundus*."⁷ St. Bonaventure steers between the old Augustinian theory and Thomism, while Duns Scotus introduces his *distinctio formalis a parte rei*.

As to the view of liberty and of the manner of exercising volitional activity Henry of Ghent, Duns Scotus and William of Occam differ from St. Thomas:

They look upon liberty as the primordial and essential attribute of volition, and ascribe to the will an absolute power of self-determination; the spontaneity of the act involves its liberty. In none of its volitions is the will *necessitated* by the good presented by the intellect: even in presence of the universal good the will preserves its freedom both of exercise and of specification, for, says Scotus, it has the power of turning aside from the intellectual presentation. This absolute indeterminism of the will reveals the mode of action of the latter faculty: the appreciation of the value of a given good by the in-

⁵S. Th. III, q. 77. a 2; I, q. 75, a 5, c.

⁶M. de Wulf, *op. cit.*, p. 101.

⁷S. C. G. II, c 59.

tellectual faculty, is merely a *conditio sine qua non*, but never exercises any *causal influence proper* on volition. While St. Thomas regards the will as a *passive faculty* in the technical sense of the word, Scotus and Occam hold it to be purely active like the *intellectus agens*.⁸

As to the essence of beatitude, St. Thomas teaches that the actual securing and enjoying of beatitude, as such, is accomplished by an act of knowledge, "*perfectam Dei cognitionem, in qua aeterna beatitudo consistit*"⁹; Scotus by an act of love, St. Bonaventure by an act of both combined.

Thomism, therefore, really differs from other currents of Scholasticism. And so will Neo-Thomism, the revival, development and adaptation of Thomism, differ from Neo-Scholasticism, the revival and development of Scholasticism, for "this new philosophy is large and comprehensive enough to pass beyond the doctrinal limitations of any individual thinker and to draw its inspiration from the whole field of scholastic philosophy."¹⁰

Did Leo XIII intend the broad development of the New Scholasticism?

In 1953 a book appeared in Vienna which speaks of the tragic guilt of both the late and the new Scholasticism.¹¹ By the late Scholasticism the author understands the Scholasticism of the sixteenth, seventeenth, and eighteenth centuries;¹² by the new Scholasticism, the development from the nineteenth century to the present.

From the subtitle of the book it appears that the author wishes to speak of the philosophy of Scholasticism,¹³ although his definition of Scholasticism rather applies to theology.¹⁴ In

⁸M. de Wulf, *op. cit.*, p. 137.

⁹S. Th. I, q. a 4.

To the whole question cf. Gallus Manser, *Das Wesen des Thomismus*. 3rd ed. Freiburg i. Br.: Paulusverlag, 1949.

¹⁰M. de Wulf, *op. cit.*, p. 159.

¹¹Anton Strigl, *Die tragische Schuld der Spaet-und Neuscholastik* (Wien: Verlag Heiler, 1953).

¹²*Ibid.*, p. 19.

¹³Renewal of philosophy in the spirit and method of St. Thomas and according to the demand of Leo XIII — "Erneuerung der Philosophie im Geiste und in der Methode des hl. Thomas nach der Forderung Leo XIII."

¹⁴*Ibid.*, p. 9: Scholasticism as a specifically Catholic method had for its purpose the deeper grasp, with the aid of reason, of the Christian truths by means of sharply dialectical development and demonstration, mutual demar-

his first chapter he refers to ecclesiastical approbations of Scholasticism beginning from Gregory IX (1228) down to Pius X, especially to the encyclical "*Aeterni Patris*" of Leo XIII and "*Pascendi*" of Pius X. Then he raises the question: What is being approved? Is Scholasticism approved in the lump by all these approbations? Is there no distinction made between Scholasticism and Scholasticism? Between the Scholasticism of the golden age (Hochscholastik), late Scholasticism (Spaetscholastik), and Neo-Scholasticism (Neuscholastik)? Upon closer examination of the texts, he says we find that 1) in all approbations only two names are mentioned, those of St. Bonaventure and St. Thomas. Albertus Magnus is mentioned as the teacher of St. Thomas. In the case of St. Thomas special attention is called by Leo XIII to his masterpiece, the *Summa Theologica*, and the renewal of philosophy in the spirit and according to the method of St. Thomas is demanded. None of the late scholastics is mentioned by name, neither Suarez, nor Bañez, nor D. Scotus; of these late scholastics it is only said: "*Quorum laus est in ecclesia*" as is the custom in the Church. But the explicit demand is made to return to St. Thomas and renew philosophy in his spirit. Thereby the Scholasticism of St. Thomas and St. Bonaventure is approved, yet not the letter of the Saint, but his spirit and his method. No approval is given to the presentday Thomism save in so far as it represents the genuine doctrine of St. Thomas.

2) The encyclical letter "*Aeterni Patris*" appeared in 1879, at a time when the renewal of the Scholasticism was already going on. No mention is made of any Neo-Scholastic either, and the demand of the Pope with regards to this new Scholasticism is again: back to Thomas! Renewal in the spirit and according to the method of St. Thomas. In any case, one cannot

cation and clarification of their relationship to each other, aims at defense against objections or attacks and proving their reasonability and agreement with true philosophy — Die Scholastik als spezifisch katholische Methode "bezweckte mit Hilfe der Vernunft die tiefere Erfassung der christlichen Wahrheiten mittels scharfer dialektischer Entwicklung und Beweisführung, gegenseitiger Abgrenzung und Klarstellung ihres Verhältnisses zu einander, erstrebt Verteidigung derselben gegen Einwendungen oder Angriffe und den Nachweis ihrer Vernuenftigkeit und Uebereinstimmung mit der wahren Philosophie." Marx, *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*, 8. Aufl., S. 441.

see in this summons any approval of the late or new Scholasticism.

3) The late and new Scholasticism is not explicitly disapproved or condemned; but does not this summons to return to St. Thomas sound like an implicit reproval?¹⁵ The summons to renew philosophy by returning to St. Thomas' spirit and method appeared during the revival of Scholasticism and was given to the representatives of Neo-Scholasticism; what else, therefore, can this summons mean but a discontent with and a disapproval of Neo-Scholasticism?

It is true that, when the encyclical appeared, the movement of Neo-Scholasticism had already started and was on its way; but it was of relatively recent origin. Leo XIII welcomed it, took a lively interest and an active part in it and thus gave the movement a decisive impulse.¹⁶ With Leo XIII a new fertile era of philosophical investigation started and continually grew in extension and increased in intensity. It was he who united the small forces that up to then had been working rather separately. The development of the movement must therefore be attributed to Leo XIII as one of its powerful causes, his influence being due mainly to his encyclical. If Leo XIII did not intend it the way it really took its course, we would have to assume that the whole generation did not understand the tenor of the encyclical or grossly ignored it, which seems rather a bold conclusion. The importance and influence of the encyclical can be gauged to some extent, on the one hand, by the enthusiastic reception it was accorded in Catholic circles, of which Leo XIII speaks in his letter to Cardinal de Luca, dated October 15, 1879,¹⁷ and, on the other hand by the aroused opposition in the liberal camp.¹⁸

On the part of the Pontiff there was no need and reason to mention any representative of the late Scholasticism since the representatives of Neo-Scholasticism, in their historical re-

¹⁵*Ibid.*, pp. 13-14; cf. p. 11.

¹⁶See *supra*, p. 96 ff.

¹⁷A. S. S. Vol. XII (1879), p. 226.

¹⁸Alois van Weddingen, *L'encyclique de S.S. Léon XIII et la Restauration de la Philosophie Chrétienne*; 3me edition (Paris: Victor Palme, 1880) p. 37. Cf. *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, Vol. XVIII (1880) p. 14 quoting the "Gazzetta di Torino." See also Josef Schmidlin, *Papstgeschichte der neuen Zeit* (Muenchen: Jos. Koesel & Fr. Pustet, 1934), II. pp. 394 ff.

search, did not stop at the period of the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries but went further back to the Middle Ages, and drew their material and inspiration from the sources of the medieval doctors. Moreover the late Scholasticism was itself a revival of medieval Scholasticism. Hence, it was but natural to draw, not on the derived, but the primary sources.

Neither was there any reason to mention representatives of Neo-Scholasticism since they were engaged in the work of reviving, developing, and adapting the medieval Scholastic synthesis, the encouragement of which was the purpose of the encyclical. Their philosophy was not a new creation, but a restoration of the medieval Scholasticism; therefore, as regards the return to the Middle Ages, Leo XIII and the Neo-Scholastics joined hands. It was, therefore, logical to mention only those doctors whose doctrine he especially wished to be the foundation of the new adaptation, the doctors of the Middle Ages, with a special preference for, and emphasis on, St. Thomas.

In dissenting from the view held by the author mentioned above it is my opinion that Leo XIII approved and promoted Neo-Scholasticism in its broad development although his preferential recommendation is given to St. Thomas, and his doctrine, spirit, and method are particularly emphasized. This opinion is founded on several reasons.

1. THE ENCYCLICAL "AETERNI PATRIS."

Leo XIII himself defined the purpose of his encyclical in the Brief *Cum hoc sit* issued on the first anniversary of its publication, which deals with the constitution of St. Thomas as heavenly Patron of all institutions of learning. This purpose is the restoration of Christian philosophy in the spirit of St. Thomas, Angelic Doctor, in Catholic schools.¹⁹ This Christian philosophy is Scholastic philosophy, the true and safe philosophical system, which found its purest, clearest, and most complete expression in the writings of St. Thomas.

¹⁹A.S.S. Vol. XIII (1880), p. 56: "... de philosophia christiana ad mentem S. Thomae Aquinatis Doctoris angelici in scholis catholicis instauranda."

Which are the criteria of the true and safe philosophy?

Leo XIII explains them in the first part of the encyclical. With the entrance of Christian revelation into this world, a new, infallible, and supreme norm of human knowledge was set up and gave the impulse to the formation of a new Christian philosophy. Consequently only that philosophic system can claim to be the true and valid, sound and solid philosophy which is a) radically Christian, that is, in accord with the revealed truths, and b) historically reaches back, at least, to the beginnings of Christianity. Now Scholastic philosophy can lay claim to these characteristics.

Men were set free by the truth of heavenly doctrines, brought down to earth by the Son of the Eternal Father, and were to be preserved by truth. But the minds of Christ's faithful are apt to be misled "by philosophy and vain deceit." Therefore it was the constant care and duty of the supreme pastors to advance by all means in their power science truly so called, and at the same time to provide with special care that all studies should accord with the Catholic faith, but especially philosophy, on which a right apprehension of the other sciences in great part depends.

In fact, the roots and a fruitful cause of the present evils and troubles lie in the false conclusions concerning divine and human things which originated in the schools of philosophy.

To lead the minds of men back to a right understanding and dispel the darkness of error, recourse must be made, besides to divine grace, to natural helps, chief among which is the evidently right use of philosophy. Only that is the right "philosophy which shall respond most fitly to the true faith, and at the same time be most consonant with the dignity of human knowledge."²⁰

a) Right philosophy responds to the true faith. Fundamentally the first part of the encyclical is a paraphrase of the fourth chapter of the dogmatical constitution on faith by the Vatican Council.²¹ So it deals with the mutual relationship between philosophy and theology. It first enumerates the services

²⁰*The Great Encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII*, p. 35.

²¹Denzinger, nn. 1795-1800.

of philosophy to theology, or the advantages which accrue to theology from philosophy.

In the first place:

philosophy, if rightly made use of by the wise, in a certain way tends to smoothe and fortify the road to true faith, and to prepare the souls of its disciples for the reception of revelation; for which reason it is well called by ancient writers sometimes a stepping stone to the Christian faith, sometimes the prelude and help of Christianity, sometimes the gospel-teacher.²²

Besides "those truths which human intelligence could not attain of itself," God revealed "others also not altogether unattainable by reason." Certain of these truths, truths which "were bound by the closest chains to a doctrine of faith, were discovered by pagan sages with nothing but their natural reason to guide them, were demonstrated and proved by becoming (aptis) arguments."

The fact of their discovery by pagan sages and their very nature proves that there is no opposition, no contradiction, but perfect harmony between reason and revelation. Thus natural knowledge or philosophy comes to the aid of the true faith, laying and proving the foundations of faith (the *praeambula fidei*). "Who does not see that a plain road is opened up to faith by such a method of philosophic study?"²³

In the second place: "A perpetual and varied service is further required of philosophy, in order that sacred theology may receive and assume the nature, form, and genius of a true science."²⁴ Christ, in teaching the revealed truths, did not follow a well defined, strictly logical plan, but proposed them according to the needs of the audience or the circumstances of events. Nor did the apostles transmit them to us in a well arranged systematic form. Yet the human mind, by an inborn tendency, craves for an organization and systematization even of the revealed truths. It is not only useful, but

of the greatest necessity to bind together, as it were, in one body the many and various parts of the

²²*The Great Encyclicals of Leo XIII*, p. 36.

²³*Ibid.*, p. 38.

²⁴*Ibid.*, p. 39.

heavenly doctrines, that, each being allotted to its own proper place and derived from its own proper principles, the whole may join together in a complete union; in order, in fine, that all and part may be strengthened by its own and the others' invincible arguments.²⁵

This more accurate or fuller knowledge and somewhat more lucid understanding of the mysteries of the faith cannot be reached without the aid of philosophy, supported by integrity of life and love of faith.

In the third place: Attacks against revelation from the camps of science and philosophy were sure to come. The enemies of the Catholic name would borrow their weapons from the arguments of philosophers. They should be met and countered by philosophy, by arguments drawn from "the store of philosophy", by "the hostile arms which human reason itself" supplies.

The duty of religiously defending the truths divinely delivered, and resisting those who dare oppose them, pertains to philosophic pursuits. Wherefore it is the glory of philosophy to be esteemed as the bulwark of the faith and the strong defense of religion.²⁶

Such are the advantages which faith and the science of faith derive from philosophy. Faith needs reason, philosophy. Therefore the "Church herself not only urges, but even commands, Christian teachers to seek the help of philosophy."²⁷

But philosophy also derives help from faith. It is true that both are distinct in nature, and have different fields of investigation. It is just and necessary that each make use of its own method, principles, and arguments. Philosophy, conscious of its own limitation, "dare not to affect to itself too great powers, nor deny" the many truths of the supernatural order which are far beyond the reach of the keenest intellect, "nor measure them by its own standard, nor interpret them at will;"²⁸ in short, drag revelation down to its own level. The human mind, "being confined within certain limits, and those narrow enough, is exposed

²⁵*Loc. cit.*

²⁶*Ibid.*, p. 40

²⁷*Ibid.*, p. 41

²⁸*Loc. cit.*

to many errors and is ignorant of many things." On the other hand, "those things which became known by revelation have the force of certain truths." Since truth is only one, it is clear that reason, if it would be true, cannot contradict a revealed doctrine. "Things which war against faith war equally against right reason."²⁹ The Catholic philosopher will know, then, "that he violates at once faith and the laws of reason if he accepts any conclusion which he understands to be opposed to revealed doctrine." Christian faith, reposing on the authority of God, is the unfailing mistress of truth and can serve philosophy as a safe guide. Those therefore, are "philosophers indeed" who to the study of philosophy unite obedience to the Christian faith.

Thus philosophy needs theology, not, indeed, its method, principles, and arguments, but its guidance and light; "for the splendor of the divine truths, received in the mind, helps the understanding, and not only detracts in no wise from its dignity, but adds greatly to its nobility, keenness, and stability."³⁰

Right philosophy cannot contradict but must be in accord with revelation.

b) The second criterion of right philosophy is continuity of development.

Just as important for the choice of the right philosophy as the first criterion is the second characteristic: continuity of development. As to its fundamental theses the true philosophy must reach down to the origin of Christianity and be in agreement and organic connection with the best achievements of the wisdom of the pre-Christian era.

Faith was in need of reason, while reason needed faith. This relationship of mutual dependence necessarily had to lead to the restoration of pre-Christian philosophy, and formation of a Christian philosophy. Christianity would soon reach and penetrate the educated people and higher intellectual strata of society. It would make it necessary for them to have clear ideas about the relation of the new faith to the pre-Christian culture. The enemies of the new faith would attack it with arguments borrowed from philosophy. Its defense against such scientific

²⁹*Loc. cit.*

³⁰*Ibid.*, p. 42.

and philosophic opponents made it necessary to develop philosophically those truths which serve as a presupposition and foundation of the faith, and to grasp speculatively the truths attacked; in other words, the study and culture of philosophy became indispensable to the Christian teacher. Moreover this development received a positive influence from the advantages which faith offered to the search of reason.

Christian philosophy did not need to start from an absolute beginning. The philosophic efforts of the pre-Christian era had not been worthless; on the contrary, the history of philosophy of the pre-Christian era could point to periods of high intellectual culture. Many of the representatives of Christian Wisdom had been reared and trained in its schools. Naturally, these men were called upon to sift, under the guidance of faith, the pagan inheritance and thus to christianize it.

The early Fathers and Doctors of the Church, who well understood that according to the divine plan, the restorer of human science is Christ, who is the power and wisdom of God, and in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge, took up and investigated the books of the ancient philosophers, and compared their teachings with the doctrines of revelation, and, carefully sifting them, they cherished what was true and wise in them and amended or rejected all else.³¹

By this process the inheritance from the pre-Christian thinkers received a change and rise which amounts to an almost new formation.

According to the rule of all temporal growth, from tiny and insignificant seeds there grew, in the course of centuries, a powerful tree of a well developed and organized system. The old adage, *Natura non agit per saltus*, applies also to the growth of thought, though it is not a question of nature alone, for we have to take into account also the operation of Divine Providence, which directs the development of ecclesiastical doctrine and science as it watches over the growth of the Church in general.

³¹*Ibid.*, p. 43.

But even so, it remains true that ordinarily Divine providence does not interfere with the order of nature; rather, in the choice of its means Divine Providence simply makes use of the powers laid down in nature. Hence it is but natural that the elaboration of the powerful system of true philosophy could not be the achievement of one single man, not even of one single period; it had to be the fruit of a long chain of intelligences, distributed over the centuries, but united with each other by uninterrupted continuity which gradually brought the philosophic thought to its perfection.

In pointing out the element of Divine Providence, Leo XIII avails himself of the words of Sixtus V:

And, with regard, Venerable Brethren, to the origin, drift, and excellence of this scholastic learning, it may be well here to speak more fully in the words of one of the wisest of our predecessors, Sixtus V.: "By the divine favor of Him who alone gives the spirit of science, and wisdom, and understanding, and who through all ages, as there may be need, enriches His Church with new blessings and strengthens it with new safeguards, there was founded in Our fathers, men of eminent wisdom, the scholastic theology, which two glorious doctors in particular, the angelic St. Thomas and the seraphic St. Bonaventure, illustrious teachers of this faculty . . . with surpassing genius, by unwearied diligence, and at cost of long labors and vigils, set in order and beautified, and, when skillfully arranged and clearly explained in a variety of ways, handed down to posterity.³²

Each of these great minds, links in the long chain, accepted, received and assimilated the fruits of the efforts of those who had preceded him. The more extensive and more comprehensive this assimilation and incorporation into the great doctrinal edifice, the better and more complete his contribution to the great system.

³²*Ibid.*, pp. 46-47.

2. SCHOLASTIC PHILOSOPHY IS THE TRUE PHILOSOPHY.

Herewith the foundation is laid for the proof that Scholastic philosophy is the true philosophy. The major premise may be stated thus: Only that philosophical system can claim to be the true and valid philosophy which is fundamentally Christian, that is, in accord with the revealed truths, and historically continuous in development, reaching down to the origin of Christianity. Now it remains to show that both characteristics apply to Scholastic philosophy. The encyclical letter elaborates this proof in its second part, turning to the history of philosophy.

3. THE PERIOD OF THE APOLOGISTS.

The men whom history calls the apologists were quick in using human wisdom, especially that inherited from the Greeks, to counter hostile attacks and prove such truths as the uniqueness of the infinitely perfect God, alone to be adored; the creation from nothing of all things by His omnipotent power; the government of all things to their ends by Divine Providence. There and then the treasure of human wisdom was enriched by truths of revelation. The apologetic writings of that period contain the main theses of Theodicy, Cosmology, and Psychology clearly and precisely expressed. The proofs of the credibility of revelation enhance the science of faith. The continuity of the apologists with the pre-Christian science is unmistakable. They used a kind of eclectic method in virtue of which they carefully picked the grains of gold from the rubbish of the old systems and transmuted them into arguments in defense of revelation.³³

St. Justin Martyr (d.165) claims the chief place among the apologists.

After having tried the most celebrated academies of the Greeks, he saw clearly, as he himself confesses,

³³Cf. Berthold Altaner, *Patrologie* (Freiburg im Breisgau: Herder, 1938) pp. 59-223.

that he could only draw truths in their fullness from the doctrines of revelation. These he embraced with all the ardor of his soul, purged of calumny, courageously and fully defended before the Roman emperors and *reconciled with them not a few of the sayings of the Greek philosophers.*³⁴

The first five of those mentioned by name: Quadratus, Aristides, Hermias, Athanagoras, and Irenaeus belong to the Greek apologists of the second century; Clement of Alexandria (d. 215), Origenes (d. 253-4), Tertullian (d. 200) to the Church writers of the third century; Arnobius (d. 310) and Lactantius, (d. 317) of the fourth century.

4. THE PATRISTIC PERIOD.

Athanasius (d. 373), Chrysostom (d. 407), Basil (d. 379), Gregory of Nyssa (d. 394), and Gregory of Nazianz (d. 390) are representatives of the flowering period of patristic literature (from the Council of Nicea 325 till the Council of Chalcedon 451).

"The early Fathers and Doctors of the Church" continued the work of the apologists with increasing zeal and skill, "took up and investigated the books of the ancient philosophers, and compared their teachings with the doctrines of revelation, and carefully sifting them, they cherished what was true and wise in them and amended or rejected all else."³⁵

Besides, the new rising heresies caused them to study more deeply, formulate more scientifically, and thus safeguard the disputed truths against objections. This required thorough philosophic research, which proved beneficial for philosophy. True, it was not so much speculative interest as practical need that determined the object of the inquiries. For whenever and wherever the purity of the revealed doctrine was imperilled, its guardians got ready to protect it. Those doctrinal disputes did not leave the Fathers enough scientific leisure to organize their knowledge into a well elaborated system, though, on the other hand,

³⁴*The Great Encyclicals of Leo XIII*, pp. 44. Italics not in the original.

³⁵*Ibid.*, p. 43

the material gathered may not have been so extensive and vast as to make them feel the need for organization or systematization. It was the task of that period to collect the material, the precious building stones, which later on, after the storms of the migration of nations had passed, and the new social structure had emerged, were sorted for the construction of the imposing edifice of Scholastic science by the great masters of early Scholasticism.

Not to cover too wide a range, we add to the number of the great men, of whom mention has been made, the names of Basil the Great and the two Gregories, who, on going forth from Athens, that home of all learning, thoroughly equipped with all the harness of philosophy, turned the wealth of knowledge which each had gathered up in a course of zealous study to the work of refuting heretics and preparing Christians.

But Augustine would seem to have wrested the palm from all. Of a most powerful genius and thoroughly saturated with sacred and profane learning, with the loftiest faith and with equal knowledge — *fide summa, doctrina pari* — he combated most vigorously all the errors of his age. What height of philosophy did he not reach? . . . Afterwards, in the East John Damascene treading in the footsteps of Basil and of Gregory Nazianzen, and in the West Boethius and Anselm following the doctrines of Augustine, *added largely to the patrimony of philosophy*.³⁶

5. THE SCHOLASTIC AGE

At the same time when the majestic cathedrals, masterpieces of human constructive art, were erected, the majestic edifice of constructive human thought arose: the elaboration of the Scholastic synthesis. It was a period of rich intellectual maturity. In the words of the encyclical:

the doctors of the middle ages, who are called scholastics, addressed themselves to a great work — that

³⁶*Ibid.*, p. 46; Italics not in the original. Augustine (d. 430); John Damascene (d 749); Boethius (d. 524); Anselm (d. 1109).

of diligently collecting, and sifting, and storing up, as it were, in one place, for the use and convenience of posterity the rich and fertile harvests of Christian learning scattered abroad in the voluminous works of the holy Fathers.³⁷

The “origin, drift, and excellence of this scholastic learning” are praised with the words which Sixtus V used in extolling Scholastic theology. Under the guidance of the provident God “who alone gives the spirit of science, and wisdom, and understanding” the Fathers, men of eminent wisdom, founded the Scholastic theology

which two glorious doctors in particular, the angelic St. Thomas and the seraphic St. Bonaventure, illustrious teachers of this faculty, . . . with surpassing genius by unwearied diligence, and at the cost of long labors and vigils, *set in order and beautified*, and, when *skilfully arranged and clearly explained* in a variety of ways, handed down to posterity.³⁸

Sixtus V directly and explicitly mentions Scholastic theology only. But according to Leo XIII these statements

may plainly be accepted as equally true of philosophy and its praises. For the noble endowments which make the scholastic theology so formidable to the enemies of truth — to wit, as the same Pontiff adds, “that ready and close coherence of cause and effect, that order and array as of a disciplined army in battle, those clear definitions and distinctions, that strength of argument and those keen discussions, . . .” those noble and admirable endowments, We say, are only to be found in a right use of that philosophy which the scholastic teachers have been accustomed carefully and prudently to make use of even in theology disputations . . . (the scholastic theology) would not have gained such honor and commendation among men if they had made use of a lame and imperfect or vain philosophy.³⁹

³⁷*Loc. cit.*

³⁸*Ibid.*, p. 47. Italics not in the original.

³⁹*Ibid.*, pp. 47-48.

6. THE ARGUMENT.

On the basis of the foregoing outlines we can now formulate the following argument.

Leo XIII called for a restoration of Christian philosophy. This Christian philosophy is Scholastic philosophy. Therefore he wanted the restoration of Scholastic philosophy. But the restoration of Scholastic philosophy was taken up and worked for by the representatives of the Neo-Scholasticism, since Neo-Scholasticism is the revival, development and adaptation of medieval Scholasticism. Therefore Leo XIII wanted, approved, and promoted the new Scholasticism.

Scholastic philosophy is *radically Christian*, because all Scholastic doctors held up and followed the principle that between reason and faith there can be no contradiction. "Those things which war against faith war equally against right reason." The adherence of the Scholastics to this principle explains the fact of the close relationship between philosophy and theology throughout the whole course of their development and their co-existence in the writing of the Scholastics who therein followed the line of the Fathers. Human wisdom grew in the service and under the protection of faith. Both philosophy and theology passed through parallel phases of development. That was not due to chance, but to the nature of both kinds of knowledge which cannot be at war with each other, but complement each other. This principle of the agreement between reason and faith was variously but constantly taught beginning from the apologists through the patristic period to the Scholastics.

Scholastic philosophy, the *philosophia perennis*, is uniquely *continuous*. It represents a great doctrinal inheritance, which has its roots in Greek philosophy, especially Plato and Aristotle, was continued and developed by the Church Fathers through slowly progressive changes and additions, and led to perfection by the great thinkers of the thirteenth century, chief among them Albert the Great, who began the systematic combination and unification of Aristotelianism with the heritage of Platonism in the form and under the name of Augustinianism, and Thomas Aquinas who completed it. It will not be out of place

to quote here once more the concise statement of Grabmann, one of the most competent authorities on Scholasticism:

Scholastic philosophy is largely determined by the transmission of intellectual material, by the influx of new sources, by the joint action of tradition and independent penetration of traditional treasures of thought. It is precisely in this continuity of life and inheritance, in this organic and progressive unfolding of previous fundamental doctrines of philosophy, that it manifests and proves itself as the *philosophia perennis*.⁴⁰

Scholastic philosophy must here be taken in its *broad denotation* as stated at the beginning of this chapter, as the “collective inheritance of the majority of the thinkers of the West and . . . synthesis common to the leading doctors of the West, i.e. in its generic meaning of which the syntheses of Albert and Thomas and Bonaventure are species”.

It is characteristic of a genus that it denotes something common to all of its species. The scholastic doctors have this in common that they agree on a “considerable number of fundamental questions”, vital, essential problems. The truth of the solution of a problem does not essentially gain in value by the authority of the person who found it or upholds it. An authority does not create or constitute the truth; he finds or discovers it. The principle of causality, for instance, retains the same intrinsic value whether proposed and defended by Socrates or Plato or Aristotle or Augustine or Thomas. All the fundamental theses on which the Scholastics are in agreement have their intrinsic value independently of this or that name. If they are found to be true with one, they must be approved with all those who maintain them, since it is the truth or doctrine which is approved.

The above mentioned author^{40a} who accuses Neo-Scholasticism of “tragic guilt” himself poses the question: What element of the golden age Scholasticism is approved? The contents (doctrine) of its philosophy or its methods? In any case its method, he maintains; for Leo XIII calls the Scholastic method the best

⁴⁰See Chapter V, note 24.

^{40a}See p. 149, note 11.

method and explicitly wants the return to the method of St. Thomas, manifestly that used in the *Summa Theologica*. The contents of the particular doctrines are herewith not yet approved, in any case not explicitly. Possibly you can admit an indirect approval of some philosophic doctrines since the golden age Scholasticism had been abandoned and the return to it is urged. But manifestly the Pope is concerned not only with the method, for to him the contents are the main point, and the method matters in so far as it leads to the right contents.⁴¹

Now this is precisely the claim of the history of philosophy, viz., that the fundamental doctrines, the solutions to vital and essential problems, are the common patrimony and possession of the medieval doctors.

When in the encyclical Leo XIII comes to speak the praises of Scholastic philosophy, he speaks of the great work of the *doctors* of the Middle Ages — “*mediae aetatis Doctores, quos Scholasticos vocant*”⁴² — among whom two are particularly mentioned. He uses the plural number in an absolute manner, i.e., with no restrictive qualification whatever. The particular praise of Thomas and Bonaventure precisely presupposes the common praise or the commendation of those among whom these two excel. It makes no sense to speak of particular excellence if there is no general excellence from which to distinguish the particular.

The common character of scholastic philosophy as a patrimony and possession of a plurality of representatives, not an exclusive property of one only, appears from two more passages of the encyclical letter.

In the first passage Leo XIII recommends the Scholastic doctrine as an excellent, in fact, the best means of winning the minds of those who are alienated from the faith, hate Catholic institutions, and claim reason as their sole mistress and guide:

apart from the supernatural help of God, nothing is better calculated to heal those minds and to bring them into favor with the Catholic faith than the solid doctrine of the Fathers and the scholastics, who

⁴¹Anton Strigl, *op. cit.*, p. 14, nr. 4.

⁴²*Leonis XIII. Pont. Max. Litterae Encyclicae duobus primis sui Pontificatus annis editae*. Romae: Ex typographia Vaticana, 1880, p. 48.

so clearly and forcibly demonstrate the firm foundations of the faith, its divine origin, its certain truth, the arguments that sustain it, the benefits it has conferred on the human race, and its perfect accord with reason. . .⁴³

In the second he defends "Our philosophy", evidently the Scholastic philosophy, against the "grossest injustice" of the accusation

of being opposed to the advance and development of natural science. For when the scholastics, following the opinion of the Holy Fathers, always held in anthropology that the human intelligence is only led to the knowledge of things without body and matter by things sensible, they well understood that nothing was of greater use to the philosopher than diligently to search into the mysteries of nature and to be earnest and constant in the study of physical things. And this they confirmed by their own example; for St. Thomas, Blessed Albertus Magnus, *and other leaders of the scholastics* were never so wholly rapt in the study of philosophy as to give large attention to the knowledge of natural things;⁴⁴

Here Leo XIII expressly speaks of the master thinkers Thomas and Albertus and *other leaders* of the Scholastics, not only Scholastics, but even leaders of the Scholastics, an expression which means that there was a plurality of thinkers representative of the philosophy of which he here speaks and which he lauds and approves, and the restoration of which he intends.

Naturally, to him this restoration was not to be a mere resuscitation of a long since defunct system, a "doctrine to be merely disinterred and left in a passive state of archeological curiosity; his aim was to have it become the groundwork of a thought that was actual and living."⁴⁵ It was not to be a slavish repetition in our time of everything that the doctors of the Middle Ages had taught in their time, but an intelligent and judicious

⁴³*The Great Encyclicals of Pope Leo XIII*, p. 54.

⁴⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 55-56. Italics not in the original.

⁴⁵L. Noel, "The Neo-Scholastic Movement in French-Speaking Countries," in John S. Zyburna, *Present-Day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism* (St. Louis: Herder, 1927) p. 214.

revival of the perennial principles and solid doctrines in application to the problems of modern time with the elimination of erroneous statements and solutions that are useless and meaningless for our time, and the abandonment of the exaggerations of method and distinctions.

If anything is taken up with too great subtlety by the scholastic doctors or too carelessly stated — if there be anything that ill agrees with the discoveries of a later age, or, in a word, improbable in whatever way, it does not enter our mind to propose that for imitation to our age.⁴⁶

On the other hand he holds “that every word of wisdom, every useful thing by whomsoever discovered or planned, ought to be received with a willing and grateful mind.”⁴⁷

The restoration of Christian, that is Scholastic philosophy, is the objective of the new Scholasticism; as such, it may then claim the approval of Leo XIII.

7. OTHER DOCUMENTS.

Letter to Cardinal de Luca. The identification of Scholastic philosophy with Christian philosophy by Leo XIII appears also in his letter to Cardinal de Luca concerning the foundation of the Roman Academy of St. Thomas and the new edition of all writings of St. Thomas.

The hideous war raging against the Church and society, aiming at their destruction, is due to the nefarious consequences of a false philosophy which started about three hundred years ago — “*vitiatæ tribus abhinc sæculis philosophiæ.*”⁴⁸ There is no quicker and better means to bring it to an end than the universal restoration of the right principles of thought and action through the philosophical sciences.

“ . . . ideoque ad summam totius causae (intelleximus) pertinere sanam solidamque ubique locorum

⁴⁶*The Great Encyclicals* . . . p. 56.

⁴⁷*Loc. cit.*

⁴⁸Letter of Leo XIII to the president and members of the Academy of St. Thomas in the Seminary of Parma. A.S.S., Vol. XIII (1880), p. 3.

reflorescere philosophiam. Litteras idcirco Encyclicas ad universos Catholici orbis Antistites nuper dedimus, quibus pluribus ostendimus huius generis utilitatem non esse alibi quaerendam, quam in philosophia christiana a prioris Ecclesiae patribus procreata et educta, quae fidei catholicae non modo maxime convenit, sed etiam defensionis et luminis alimenta praebet. Eam ipsam, decursu aetatum magnis fecundam fructibus, a S. Thoma Aquinate, summo Scholasticorum Magistro quasi hereditario iure acceptam commemoravimus.⁴⁹

The vitiated philosophy of the modern period, starting with the Renaissance, which openly boasted of its break with the past and its own "originality", is here contrasted with the philosophy of the previous centuries, the result of a long evolution reaching its greatest perfection in the writings of St. Thomas. It is qualified by Leo XIII as the sound and solid philosophy. St. Thomas is called the supreme teacher among the Scholastics. This praise of St. Thomas as supreme among them necessarily presupposes and involves the praise of the rest of the Scholastics, and herewith the commendation of their philosophy.

Allocution to International Congress of Scholars. On the feast of St. Thomas 1880 the Pontiff received and addressed⁵⁰ a huge number of scholars from different countries whom he praised for their supreme efforts to combine the glory of science with love of religion, and so to cultivate the human arts as to pay equal honor to the divine authority of Christ and the Church; for their practical profession, that obedience to the Christian faith in no way is prejudicial to the dignity of human reason, on the contrary, of great advantage; for men see the truth better and attain to it more safely, if divine faith shines like a torch on the minds eager for knowledge.

Unfortunately there are many who do not understand this or deny this, and hence commit grave errors. They make light of divinely revealed truths, or even reject them because they believe that they cannot be reconciled with statements of human sciences or modern theories; they attack vehemently the divine

⁴⁹A.S.S. Vol. XII (1879), p. 225.

⁵⁰A.S.S., Vol. XII (1879), pp. 486-488.

power of the Church because they think that it is inimical to the newly asserted right of the civil state, the sovereignty of rulers and prosperity of the peoples.

The cause of this deplorable state is to be sought in the neglect of the more severe and higher studies. The false opinions and new claims are based on the glittering lies of a vain philosophy — "*splendidis quibusdam inanis philosophiae mendaciis.*"⁵¹ A most opportune remedy for this great disorder and confusion of the minds is ready in the sound and solid philosophy the necessity of whose restoration he had advocated in the previous years. The description of both philosophies, the vain and the solid and sound, their opposite results, and his own formulation of the objection that "*sancti Thomae et Scholasticorum doctrinam in honorem revocantes, retrahere velle dicimur ad superiorum saeculorum parum excultam urbanitatem tamquam Nos maturitatis et perfectionis aevi nostri pigeret*"⁵² show that the sound and solid philosophy is that of St. Thomas and the other Scholastics — *S. Thomae et Scholasticorum*.

In an audience given to the students of the Gregorian University on Nov. 27, 1878 he said to the students: "La vraie sagesse, c'est celle qu'ont enseignée les Pères et les docteurs scolastiques et a leur tête Saint Thomas d'Aquin."⁵³

8. LEO'S XIII APPROVAL OF MERCIER'S CONCEPTION OF THE RESTORATION.

In his encyclical *Aeterni Patris* Leo XIII urged the return to tradition and above all to the teachings of St. Thomas. But he was not contented with exhortations only, he soon took several practical steps to implement this encyclical.⁵⁴ On December 25, 1880 he sent a brief to Card. Dechamps, archbishop of Malines, ordering the erection, at the University of Louvain, of a special chair for the philosophy of St. Thomas.⁵⁵ This course was to

⁵¹*Ibid.*, p. 487.

⁵²*Loc. cit.*

⁵³*Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, IX, 353.

⁵⁴Josef Schmidlin, *op. cit.*, II, pp. 395 ff.

⁵⁵Louis de Raeymaeker, "Les Origines de l'Institut Supérieur de Louvain," *Revue Philosophique de Louvain* II, (Novembre, 1951), p. 508.

be free of charge, non-obligatory, and open to all students, lay as well as ecclesiastic, especially those of the theological course. At that time, the University of Louvain was the only complete Catholic university ⁵⁶ and the Pope envisioned the advantages which this Catholic university center, where all the sciences were taught, and experts or specialists in all branches of human wisdom daily met, offered for the renovation of medieval philosophical concepts. The Belgian Bishops agreed on proposing the Abbé Désiré Mercier for this chair, and Leo XIII approved the proposal on Aug. 19, 1882. In order to meet the full desire of the Pontiff, Mercier betook himself to Rome. The rector of the university had advised him to get into contact with the principal representatives of the Neo-Scholastic movement in Italy. Leo XIII gave him a similar order. Mercier conferred with Cardinals Pecci and Zigliara, with Fathers Liberatore and Cordoldi; he also established connection with the Neo-Scholastic group of Naples, especially with Giuseppe Prisco and Salvatore Talmo. Leo XIII, in a private audience, approved the directives for the organization of the course.⁵⁷ The course "de haute philosophie de Saint Thomas" opened in October of 1882. In the introductory lecture Mercier declared:

Chargé d'interpréter devant vous la pensée de saint Thomas, je regarde comme mon devoir d'ouvrir mes leçons par cette déclaration par laquelle il débute lui-même: "Locus ab auctoritate quae fundatur super ratione humana est infirmissimus" (Ia, q. I. a. 8. ad 2) . . . Qu'est-ce, en résumé, que la philosophie de saint Thomas? Il me semble qu'on la reconnaît à deux traits bien caractéristiques: le premier, c'est l'union de la raison et de la foi chrétienne; le second, c'est l'union de l'observation et de spéculation rationnelle, la combinaison de l'analyse et de la synthèse.⁵⁸

Mercier's position in the Neo-Scholastic movement (cf. supra p. 62) was prepared by his preliminary studies in the

⁵⁶*Ibid.*, p. 509. Cf. Raphael Tambuyser, "L'érection de la Chaire de Philosophie Thomiste à l'Université de Louvain, *Revue Philosophique de Louvain* LVI, (Août, 1958) p. 481.

⁵⁷Raeymaeker, *op. cit.*, p. 513.

⁵⁸*Ibid.*, p. 515.

seminary. There he privately came first to know Scholasticism through the manual of Tongiorgi, then through the works of Kleutgen, and finally through his studies of the writings of St. Thomas himself. Besides, Mercier had a great interest in the sciences; already during the time of his preparatory studies he loved to discuss the relation between science and faith. As a young professor of philosophy in the seminary at Malines he continued his studies in the same spirit. Even then he had already acquired a vast erudition; his direct knowledge of the works of St. Thomas was quite imposing. His lecture notes contain, however, also long quotations from a great number of other Scholastics, modern non-Scholastic philosophers and men of science.⁵⁹

In the fall of 1888, Mercier founded the *Société Philosophique de Louvain*, an association of former students of his philosophical course. The members of this association were bound to help realize the plans of Leo XIII by familiarizing wider circles with the teachings "drawn from the sources of the great Scholasticism" (*enseignements puisés aux sources de la grande scolastique*). This society nourished

le légitime espoir de devenir un centre de vie intellectuelle et de rallier autour d'elle tous ceux qui s'intéressent à l'étude de la philosophie.

From among the members of this association Mercier chose the professors for the Institut supérieur de philosophie; from this association also came the initiative to found, in 1894, the *Revue Néo-Scholastique*.

9. L'INSTITUT SUPERIEUR DE PHILOSOPHIE.

The unexpected success of the *cours de haute philosophie de saint Thomas* encouraged Leo XIII to push his plans farther. He wants more than a chair for, or a course of, Thomistic philosophy; he wants "a center of studies." Mercier reports to the Belgian bishops on the desire of Leo XIII, explained to him by the Pontiff in the audience of September 1882. The Pope said:

⁵⁹*Ibid.*, p. 520, note 23.

Ce n'est pas un simple cours que je désire... mais un centre d'études pour la propagation des doctrines de saint Thomas... Nous devons montrer combien (ces doctrines) s'harmonisent avec tous les progrès des sciences. Ce sera *mon* institution.⁶⁰

At Easter in 1887, Mercier proposed to Leo XIII a plan for the extension of the teaching of philosophy, which the Pope studied personally. In a brief of November 8, 1889 to Card. Goossens, the Pope sanctioned the proposals of Mercier and thereby gave virtual existence to the *Institut Supérieur de Philosophie*. In the brief he underlines the necessity, at the present, for Catholics to cultivate science in order to destroy the hateful legend that the Church is a seat of ignorance (*un foyer d'ignorance*). Mercier's objective, which he never ceased to assert, was in exact agreement with the intentions of Leo XIII, which was "*de mettre la philosophie thomiste à la portée du monde intellectuel moderne, des laïques, des hommes de science, et, pour cela, de la montrer en harmonie avec les sciences.*"⁶¹ The plan had, therefore, to combine an extensive course of philosophy with a course of sciences among which Mercier gave principal attention to the physical, biological, historical, and philosophical sciences. The strong orientation of Mercier towards the sciences, especially, scientific research, was a reflection of the spirit prevailing at that time. There were special reasons for the Catholic University to devote herself to pure or "disinterested" science. An end had to be put to the legend of the obscurantism of the Church, the submission of the Catholic savants to an authority reputedly ignorant of the positive facts of present-day science, the widely spread conviction of the incompatibility of the Catholic faith with the freedom of scientific research. Mercier⁶² made himself an eloquent interpreter of these ideas in his report to the Catholic Congress of Malines:

Les catholiques vivent *isolés* dans le monde scientifique; ils sont frappés de suspicion, traités avec indifférence; leurs publications ont grand'peine à

⁶⁰*Ibid.*, p. 528, note 37.

⁶¹*Ibid.*, p. 534.

⁶²*Ibid.*, pp. 540-541.

franchir l'enceinte du monde croyant et si elles la dépassent, elles sont généralement sans écho . . . Or, cet état *d'isolement intellectuel* est fatal à la foi et à la science.

“There is but one remedy”:

Former des *hommes*, en plus grand nombre, qui se vouent à la science pour elle-même, sans but professionnel, sans but apologétique, qui *travaillent de première main* à façonner les matériaux de l'édifice scientifique et contribuent ainsi à son élévation progressive; *se créer les ressources* que ce travail réclame, tel est le double but auquel doivent tendre aujourd'hui les efforts de ceux qui se préoccupent du prestige de l'Eglise dans le monde et de l'efficacité de son action sur les âmes.

That spirit was to animate the activity of the *Institut Supérieur de la Philosophie*.

In October 1893 Mercier was again received by Leo XIII who “*manifesta une vive satisfaction de tout ce qui venait de se faire pour réaliser ses intentions*”.⁶³ In the brief dated March 7, 1894 “*il approuve formellement le programme des études, le rapprochement de la doctrine de saint Thomas et des sciences physiques, naturelles et sociales*.”

Henry de Dorlodot, faculty member, accused Mercier to the Pope of conducting his work according to methods contrary to the intentions manifested in the pontifical documents. The Pope, however, upheld his confidence in Mercier; and to show how much he supported Mercier he let the Nuncio to Belgium demand the dismissal of H. de Dorlodot.

Mercier explained his views on the development of philosophy in Catholic circles as also on the conditions required for a Scholastic renovation in the *Dirus Thomas*, XIV (1893), published at Piacenza. His view on the nature of the Neo-Scholastic movement he laid down in his article “La Philosophie Néo-Scholastique” which appeared as the first article of the first number of the *Revue Néo-Scholastique* which Louis de Raeymaeker⁶⁴ out-

⁶³*Ibid.*, p. 554.

⁶⁴*Ibid.*, pp. 564 ff.

lined in his article on the origin of the Institut Supérieur: Since a half century the Middle Ages have been made the object of studies which resulted in esteem of that age formerly so decried. Philosophy occupies an important place in this research-movement. Leo XIII greatly contributed to it and helped to arouse a renovation of medieval thought. But the question must be “*de repenser celle-ci (pensée médiévale) en fonction de notre époque, d'en faire une néo-scholastique*”, this is the task to which the *Institute Supérieur de Philosophie de Louvain* has put itself.

The friends of Scholastic philosophy suffer from a general situation affecting Catholic savants: they are kept confined among themselves in a kind of isolation. They are presumed to be enslaved to dogmas in every domain, philosophy not excluded. Though, “*si nous songions à asservir notre pensée, en philosophie, à celle d'un maître, celui-ci s'appelât-il sai Thomas, c'est Saint Thomas lui-même qui nous condamnerait.*”⁶⁵

There is another reason which impedes the “*peripatétisme scolastique*” to exert its influence on modern thought: it does not take sufficient account of the transformation which science has undergone in our time: “*La science n'a plus ces visées compréhensives, ces allures synthétiques; elle est, avant tout, une science d'observations partielles, minutieuses, une science d'analyse.*” Besides, “*la science contemporaine se préoccupe grandement, et à bon droit, de la genèse première et de vicissitudes historiques des idées ou des systèmes.*”⁶⁵

The development of analytical research has called forth the multiplication of particular sciences and led inevitably to specialization. Nevertheless, the unity of these sciences must be assured, for “*la science n'est pas une accumulation de faits, c'est un système embrassant les faits et leur mutuelles relations, ce n'est pas un agrégat d'atomes, c'est un organisme.*”⁶⁵ But has it not become practically impossible to comprehend the ensemble of these sciences and absorb them into one philosophical system?

“La difficulté, en effet, est grave et il est permis de dire, en thèse générale, que ce n'est pas le fait d'un seul homme de la résoudre. Dès lors, comme en pré

⁶⁵Raeymaecker, “La Philosophie Néo-Scholastique” 1894, pp. 15-17, *op. cit.*, pp. 564 ff.

sence du champ d'observation qui va s'élargissant tous les jours, les efforts individuels sont impuissants, il faut que l'association supplée à l'insuffisance du travailleur isolés, et que des hommes d'analyse et de synthèse se réunissent pour réaliser, par leur commerce journalier et leur action commune, un milieu approprié au développement harmonieux de la science et de la philosophie."^{65a}

This was to be the objective of the *Institut Supérieur de Philosophie de Louvain*.

Mercier saw in Positivism the principal adversary of his time. It had as a positive element its stress on facts; but its disastrous error was its metaphysical agnosticism: the restriction of human knowledge to one mode of perception only, to one category of objects only, the world of physical realities. Mercier wanted to show that sound philosophy reconciled the positive study of facts with their metaphysical explanation; and he did it on the basis of Thomistic principles. Thomas already had worked out his theories in close and constant contact with facts. Now, the incessantly progressive sciences of nature and of mind have procured us empirical descriptions which are much more exact and precise than those of the past. The defenders of Thomism must take the pain to renew, without cease, their doctrines by integrating into their research the results obtained by the science of observation. They may not, on account of intellectual indolence, content themselves with the facts of ordinary or common experience, sometimes so superficial and inexact, when the sciences offer them results of superior observation. Mercier put between the scientifically established facts and philosophic reflection the relation which the Thomistic tradition was accustomed to place between the facts of ordinary experience and the work of philosophers.

All philosophical investigation has, then, to feed on the supply of experience perfected by methodical observation "*à chacune des branches spéciales de la philosophie: à la Cosmologie, les sciences physiques et mathématiques; à la Psychologie, les sciences naturelles; à la Philosophie morale, enfin, les sciences morales et plus spécialement les sciences sociales, économiques et*

^{65a}*Ibid.*, p. 565.

politiques."^{65b} The Institute of Louvain, according to Mercier, "tâchera de s'intéresser aux sciences physiques, biologiques, politiques et sociales, de les considérer objectivement et dans leur evolution historique; elle sera attentive aux synthèses qu'elles préparent, les approchera des doctrines traditionnelles de l'Ecole et espère justifier, par ce rapprochement même, son titre de *néo-scolastique.*"^{65c}

The most urgent task appeared to Mercier to be the adaptation of the scholastic theories to the scientific findings.

History of philosophy was to have an important place in the program of the Institute. All its epochs, antiquity, the middle ages, modern times, and the contemporary philosophy, would be "*cultivée avec ferveur.*" Mercier decided to profit from all its lessons. For it was not a question of simply "*retourner en arrière, ni d'asservir notre pensée à celle d'un maître, ce maître fût-il saint Thomas d'Aquin*"^{65d}. No doubt, when after due examination a person remains convinced that a doctrine represents the most powerful efforts of thought, a solution which comes nearest to the fundamental problems of the mind, he has a duty to subscribe to it, under pain of betraying the truth. But, philosophy is not a finished work, it is as living as the mind itself that conceives it; it is an organism, always young, always active, which our personal efforts must sustain and nourish to assure its perpetual growth.

In this constant endeavor one must profit from all and every truth wherever it offers itself:

"nous nous réclamons de Platon, de Descartes, de Leibniz, de Kant, de Fichte, de Hegel, de Wundt, aussi pleinement peut-être et à coup sûr aussi sincèrement que ceux qui nous rangent dans un parti opposé au leur; si nous différons d'eux, c'est que nous n'excommunions de notre zèle à l'étudier aucun génie en raison seule de son époque."⁶⁶

As it was unjust, yesterday, to neglect, to leave out, to pass or jump over the Middle Ages, so it would be, today, to skip

^{65b}*Ibid.*, p. 569.

^{65c}*Ibid.*, p. 569.

^{65d}*Ibid.*, p. 570.

⁶⁶Mercier, *Les Origines de la Psychologie contemporaine*, 1899, p. 449 quoted by Raeymaeker, *op. cit.*, p. 570.

modern philosophy. The Neo-Scholastics must keep in contact with their contemporaries. "Averroes, Siger de Brabant, Pierre Olive, are dead, they belong to history; but Kant, Spencer, Comte live today in the milieu of the contemporary intellectuals; their spirit is spread everywhere in the atmosphere which we breathe. We would prove that we have quite little trust in the solidity and efficacy of our doctrines, if we hesitated to confront them with those that we meet at every corner of the street."

Mercier wished to work with all philosophers of good will. That was the reason why he wrote all his works in French, a living language, and why he started and launched the *Revue Néo-Scholastique*. It was the question of putting to full value the watchword which the *Revue* carried on its title page: *Nova et vetera*. The *Revue* called on all who are willing to combine "les leçons de la sagesse antique avec les découvertes et les investigations de nos contemporains."⁶⁷

10. MERCIER'S VIEWS OPPOSED.

Mercier found opposition from the rector of the University, who felt bypassed by Mercier's direct correspondence with Leo XIII and the Secretary of State. The rector was supported by members of the faculty who had studied at Rome, and the president of the Belgian College at Rome, Mgr. de T'Serglaes who feared competition for his college from the seminary "Léo XIII" which Mercier had founded at Louvain. They contended "que l'oeuvre de la rénovation thomiste, voulu par le Pape et à laquelle on travaillait à Rome, ne pouvait mieux s'accomplir qu'à Rome, ou elle se réalisait sous les yeux du Pape"⁶⁸ and whoever deviated from the course followed at Rome could not fully meet the will of the Supreme Pontiff. In the view of de T'Serglaes the best one could do was to copy what was being done at the Gregorian University.

According to Mercier's conception, however, the Institut Supérieur de Philosophie was "*une Ecole S. Thomas*," the philosophy of St. Thomas was held there "*fondamentalement vraie*".

⁶⁷Mercier, "*Le bilan philosophique au dix-neuvième siècle*," *Revue Neo-Scholastique* (1900), p. 327, quoted by Raeymaeker, *op. cit.*, p. 571, note. 122.

⁶⁸Raeymaeker, *op. cit.*, p. 576.

not because one finds it useful to conform oneself to a venerable tradition or to submit with closed eyes to some decree, but because, from a strictly philosophical point of view, one has grasped its truth value."

Besides, this *Institut* was a higher (supérieur) institute, to wit, a center of research. It was not enough to re-edit and spread the writings of St. Thomas. This had certainly to be done. But beyond this it was necessary to resume the problems and the solution of the scholastics, re-think them by confronting them with the preoccupations and needs of the present time; keep them alive by adapting them to the actual conditions of intellectual life, modifying and completing them as the need might be. In this sense the Thomist philosophy was not a completely finished work, it was daily in the making (*in fieri*) and demanded a constant effort of initiative and research.

The most urgent effort must be exerted along the front of the sciences; their development in the course of the nineteenth century, as wide as it was rapid, brought about the feeling that there arose a wide gap between the findings of the sciences duly established and the traditional philosophical conceptions. It must be shown that there was no radical discord between the sciences and the Thomistic doctrine.

Moreover, in our time historical research, so abundantly cultivated in every domain, has spread an atmosphere which we cannot neglect. The evolution of philosophic thought through the ages, in particular the history of Scholasticism and singularly of Thomism, needed systematic study. The historical truth, as all truth, possesses an unquestionable value. The Thomistic doctrine had nothing to lose; on the contrary, it could receive much clarification in the light of history.

Finally, the accomplishment of this task would be greatly helped by keeping close contact with the different currents of contemporary thought.

Mercier therefore directed his attention towards uniting in his institute a group of savants, each one of whom would be a specialist in a branch of the sciences and in addition would possess adequate philosophical training to permit him to study the scientific facts from the point of view of philosophy.

It is of great importance for our purpose to note well the difference between the opinion of the rector and that of Mercier.

The rector claimed that, according to the will of the Pope, the institute had but one aim: to give more prominence and amplitude to the teaching of the philosophy of St. Thomas. Mercier, however, assigned to his institute a double purpose or objective: teaching and, above all, research; he took pains to show that his views agreed with the documents of the Pope. According to Mercier, the difference of view on this point was fundamental and seemed irreducible. In fact, the rector wanted the transmission of finished philosophical knowledge to receptive (passive) students, while Mercier aimed at the formation of scholars to whom more initiative and freedom could be left. According to the rector, the Pope desired philosophy, in fact, traditional Thomism; consequently it was necessary to watch that the teaching at the *Institut* remain faithful to tradition in conformity to the ways and methods, followed in the principal institutes of philosophy and theology at Rome. Consequently he endeavored to show that the objectives of Mercier were in direct opposition to the will of Leo XIII. For Mercier wanted to found philosophy on the results of the sciences; but this was contrary to tradition, which made use of common or ordinary experience only. To proceed as Mercier planned, was to deliver philosophy to incessant variations, since the sciences of nature were in constant evolution while the immutable truths of philosophy had to be established, as they always have been, by reason with the aid of common experience only, accessible to all — and always. Moreover, even the traditional way would apply, as far as possible, the scholastic principles to the facts of the physical sciences so that the doctrines of St. Thomas might exert this favorable influence on the sciences.

Mercier insisted that founding philosophy on established scientific facts would in no way endanger faithfulness to tradition since scientifically established facts differ from facts of common experience only by their degree of more intense clearness and minute precision due to the methods of observation and control possible to the sciences. Moreover, even though the scientific theories be subject to change, the facts themselves and

the laws are not; and philosophy would be built on the facts, not on the theories. But traditional philosophy would never exert its salutary influence on the scientific world if its representatives refused to take notice of what was going on in this world of researchers and take part in the exchange of the views elaborated there.

On 20 February 1895 the rector sent to the Congregation of Studies documents concerning the nature of the difference between him and Mercier. Mercier, on his part, addressed a letter to the Pope and asked, besides, for an audience.

The action of the Congregation was on the whole, no doubt, more favorable to the rector than to Mercier. The members of the Congregation thought it necessary to stress the authority of the rector, hence to restrict the independence of the president of the *Institut* granted him by the Pope himself; to impose more serious study of the philosophy of St. Thomas, and to check the excessive enthusiasm for the sciences. With regard to the aims of the *Institut* the text said: "*le but de l'Institut, selon l'intention exprimée par son auguste Fondateur, est de donner plus de développement à l'enseignement de la philosophie thomiste au sein de l'Université.*"⁶⁹ Its exposition should be extensive and intensive — *avec ampleur et profondeur*.

Evidently, the Congregation wished to save, as far as possible, the principles which inspired the teaching in the Roman institutions, but its directives or "statutes" profoundly upset the program and the plans of Mercier. An almost mortal blow to the Institute was the cancellation of the concession made orally by Leo XIII to Mercier in the audience of September 1882, confirmed by a subsequent letter of Card. Jacobini, Secretary of State, and renewed in another audience in 1885⁷⁰ to use French as the means of instruction. The Congregation decreed: "*Les cours généraux, sauf le cours historique et ceux des sciences naturelles, seront donnés en latin*"—adding as explanation: "*sans quoi il serait difficile d'entrer dans la pensée de saint Thomas, les élèves ne se familiariseraient pas avec son langage et partant*

⁶⁹*Ibid.* p. 584.

⁷⁰*Ibid.* p. 586.

ne se rendaient pas aptes à étudier par eux-mêmes les écrits du saint Docteur."⁷¹ In a letter, dated 15 July 1895, to Card. Goossens, the Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation, Mazzella, explained that this matter had been brought to the attention of the Pope who could not remember to have ever authorized the use of French as the means of instruction — "*huiusmodi veniam nunquam dedisse meminit.*" It was the express will of the Holy Father that from now on Latin be used.

It is well to note that Card. Mazzella was in ignorance of all the former decisions concerning the *Cours de Philosophie de saint Thomas* since all questions had been settled directly with the Holy Father or the Secretary of State. The Congregation of Studies had never intervened in these matters. Card. Mazzella himself, who had been professor at the Gregorian University and used to give all his lectures in Latin, could not conceive that the teaching of deeper Scholasticism could be given in a language other than Latin. Mercier's arguments made no impression whatsoever on him.

All efforts on the part of Mercier, the Belgian bishops, a number of Mercier's friends, the Belgian minister of Sciences and Arts, Msgr. Rinaldini, former nuncio to Belgium and actual substitute at the secretariate of State, for a change of the decision remained without effect. On 18 December 1895, after an audience with the Pope, Card. Mazzella wrote a sharp and almost contemptuous⁷² letter to Card. Goossens, restating that the teaching had to be in Latin. A personal letter of the Pope, dated 6 February 1896, made it once more clear to Card. Goossens that the Pope himself required Latin as a means of instruction in all subjects, except the natural and historical sciences.

Evidently, the Pope was under the influence of Card. Mazzella; the latter under that of the President of the Belgian College at Rome, and he again stood under the inspiration of the rector of the University. The adversaries of Mercier had presented him in Rome "*comme voulant se soustraire à l'autorité du Recteur, installer une petite université indépendante au sein*

⁷¹*Ibid.*, p. 585.

⁷²*Ibid.*, p. 587.

de l'Université"⁷³ and the Pope was very much discontented at the thought that a work founded by himself had become a cause of trouble and dissension.

11. REVERSAL OF SITUATION.

Early in 1897 the tension between Mercier and the Congregation began to ease down. Cardinal Mazzella was soon to leave his office to be replaced by Cardinal Satolli. The imminent change mitigated the attitude of the Cardinal Prefect. The prudence of Roman diplomacy also dissuaded more and more the Congregation from following the adversaries of Mercier. A detailed report of the Belgian bishops, through Mgr. Du Roussaux, made the head of the Congregation doubtful so as to receive further accusations against Mercier with caution. A proof of the Pope's renewed benevolence came in the unexpected approval of the Institute's program for the length of six years and the extension of the right to confer degrees. Mgr. Nava di Bontife, former nuncio to Belgium, after an audience with the Pope, wrote to Mercier that he could be "*pleinement rassuré*." The Congregation as well as the Pope were anxious to see the teaching of philosophy in the *Institut* quickly established in a complete and definitive fashion. The change of the situation became complete with the new Cardinal Prefect.

Cardinal Satolli belonged to the group of Thomists which Leo XIII, while archbishop of Perugia, had founded together with his brother Joseph, then professor of the seminary at Perugia.⁷⁴ After the publication of the encyclical *Aeterni Patris*, Satolli was called to Rome to teach in the College of the Propaganda. Later on he was sent to the United States of America as Apostolic Delegate. From this post he returned to Rome in 1897 to assume the office of Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation of Studies.

⁷³According to l'abbé Keesen, who conversed with Card. Ferrata, P. Lepidi, and personnel of the secretariate of state. *Ibid.*, p. 588, note 139.

⁷⁴The scientific Academy of St. Thomas Aquinas at Perugia was inaugurated by Mgr. Joachim Pecci in 1859 "in order chiefly to impel the clergy to cultivate the higher studies and the scholastic philosophy and theology." Bernard O. Reilly, *Life of Leo XIII* (London: Rivington & Co., 1903), p. 168.

Mercier hastened to inform him of the problems of the *Institut*. Actually, Satolli was already well informed of the affairs of Louvain through Thomas Bouquillon, a Belgian, doctor of theology from the Gregorian University, professor at Washington, a good friend of Mercier. Besides, Satolli had personally studied the works of Mercier, whom he held "*un thomiste de premier ordre*." He approved "*pleinement la manière dont, à Louvain, l'on comprenait la restauration du thomisme*."⁷⁵ Knowing that Mercier had been exposed to a persecution he wanted to do him justice.

In the letter of 11 February 1898 Satolli praises the works of Mercier and his collaborators, their conception of the Thomistic restoration in close contact with the modern sciences and for the use of lay men, according to the intention of the Pope.⁷⁶ As to the use of French as the means of instruction, he is categorically opposed to the opinion of Mazzella. Since this letter was a private letter of the Card. Prefect, the rector questioned its obligatory force. Consequently steps were taken at Rome to clarify the doubt. Satolli, in an audience on May 15, brought the matter to Leo XIII and spoke to him of the *Institut*. "*Le Pape semble avoir été pleinement d'accord avec lui*."⁷⁷ As the rector continued to cause difficulties, Card. Vincenzo Vannutelli, Legate of the Pope to the Eucharistic Congress at Brussels, June 1898, was entrusted with the task of settling the situation at the *Institut*. After his investigation the Legate "*demandait qu'on exécute les instructions données par le Cardinal Préfet de la Congregation des Etudes et il insista sur le fait que la volonté expresse du Pape était que l'enseignement se fît en français*."⁷⁸

The Pope confirmed the decision of the Legate on the occasion of an audience he gave to Belgian pilgrims, 27 December 1900:

Je suis heureux de voir à votre tête les professeurs de l'Institut fondé par moi à Louvain... Non seule-

⁷⁵*Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, IXL (Novembre, 1951), p. 597 and p. 601, note 165.

⁷⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 598-599. See extracts from this letter in the Appendix.

⁷⁷*Ibid.*, p. 603.

⁷⁸*Ibid.*, p. 604. Cf. note 176.

ment les études de philosophie servent aux clercs mais aussi aux laïques qui, après avoir pris d'autres grades, viennent étudier la philosophie de saint Thomas. . . Voilà pourquoi, tout en tenant à ce que la philosophie de saint Thomas soit étudiée dans le texte latin, nous avons établi que les cours seraient donnés en français. . . Je veux et je souhaite la prospérité de mon Institut.⁷⁹

12. ARGUMENT.

The movement of Louvain, from its start, was a major representative of the new Scholasticism. "*L'institut de Louvain, mais surtout sa Revue firent la fortune des mots "néo-scholastique" et "néo-thomiste"*".⁸⁰ It received its imprint from Mercier. Mercier's definition of the philosophy of St. Thomas, his conception of authority in the field of reason, the scope of the *Société Philosophique de Louvain*, nature and purpose of the *Revue Néo-Scholastique*,⁸¹ his ideas of the nature and purpose of the Neo-Scholastic philosophy, the relation of this philosophy to the particular sciences⁸² and the modern currents of philosophic thought, the position of the history of philosophy⁸³ in this system, and the difference of the Institut of Louvain from the institutes of Rome (Mazzella asked Mercier: "*Pourquoi ne pas faire comme a Rome?*") : all these showed that Mercier conceived the restoration on a broader basis and within the large frame

⁷⁹*Ibid.*, p. 608.

⁸⁰*Ibid.*, pp. 563 & 617. As to the scientific activity of the Institut see p. 608 ff. and pp. 620 ff.

⁸¹*Ibid.*, p. 615. "La Revue Néo-Scholastique poursuit la réalisation d'un programme doctrinal . . . Ce programme tient en peu de mots: Soumettre au contrôle scientifique les grandes synthèses de la scolastique médiévale et la tenir en contact avec les conclusions bien établies de la science et de la philosophie (sic) contemporaine." *Revue Néo-Scholastique*, VI, 1899, p. 6.

⁸²*Ibid.*, p. 567, note 109: "... le respect dû aux sciences et le nécessité de demeurer en contact permanent avec elles! N'est-ce pas pour les avoir méconnus, que la tradition scolastique s'est tenue, aux seizième et dix-septième siècles, à l'écart de toute pensée vivante et qu'elle a encouru un discrédit dont aujourd'hui encore elle a peine à se relever?" Cf. P. Coffey, "Philosophy and the Sciences at Louvain", in M. de Wulf, *op. cit.*, Appendix, pp. 263-317.

⁸³Very fruitful work in the field of medieval philosophy in general, and medieval Scholasticism in particular, and related questions has been done by Maurice de Wulf. See the enumeration of his works, *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, IXL (Novembre, 1951) p. 612.

of the new Scholasticism. Leo XIII approved the conception and the plans of Mercier, called the *Institut Supérieur* even his institute; hence it must be concluded that Leo XIII approved and promoted the new Scholasticism in its wider meaning.

A confirmation of this broader view can also be deduced from Leo's XIII own words by which he determined the goal of the Roman Academy of St. Thomas:

Auctores sumus, ut coetus Academicus in Urbe Romana instituitur, qui s. Thomae Aquinatis nomine et patronatu insignis, eo studia industriamque convertat, ut eius opera explanet, illustret; placita exponat et cum aliorum philosophorum sive veterum sive recentium placitis conferat; vim sententiarum earumque rationes demonstret; salutarem doctrinam propugnare, et ad grassantium errorum refutationem recensque inventorum illustrationem adhibere contendat.⁸⁴

Article 2 of the statutes of the *Institut* sounds like an echo of these words; "*L'institut a pour but de promouvoir l'étude et l'enseignement de la philosophie dans l'esprit de saint Thomas d'Aquin. L'enseignement a pour objet la philosophie thomiste dans ses rapports avec les sciences naturelles et sociales et avec l'histoire de la philosophie.*"⁸⁵

The following is the interpretation of the new Scholasticism by a contemporary of Leo XIII:

Rightly understood, therefore, the new scholasticism is no mere re-editing, no mere systematic and uncritical justification of everything that has been, rightly or wrongly, labelled with the elastic title of 'Scholastic Philosophy.' The new scholasticism has all that is best in medieval scholasticism, enriched and completed, moreover, by modern science adapted to the needs of our time, directed in its tendencies by the spirit and teaching of the Papal Encyclical. In other words: the aim and object of the new scholasticism is ever to go on increasing and adapting to

⁸⁴A. S. S., Vol. XII (1879), p. 226

⁸⁵*Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, 1951, p. 628.

present needs the patrimony of truths bequeathed to us by those who have gone before us, and especially by St. Thomas.⁸⁶

According to the conception of the new Scholastics, these are essential features of the new Scholasticism: It accepts the "patrimony of ancient wisdom,"⁸⁷ all that is best in medieval Scholasticism, especially the teaching of St. Thomas, and builds upon it. Its aim is to increase, enrich and complete it by applying and adapting it to present needs and problems, keeping in close contact with the progress of the particular sciences, the history of philosophy, and the currents of non-scholastic contemporary thought.

With this Leo XIII agrees. He wants the return to the "scholastic philosophy,"⁸⁸ that "system of philosophy which Our Fathers so dearly loved," as distinguished from the "novel philosophy," the product of "the struggling innovators of the sixteenth century," whom it pleased "to philosophize without any respect for faith," depending "on the authority and choice of any professor."⁸⁹ The *vetera*, explained, illustrated, arranged, and unified by St. Thomas, are *novis agenda et perficienda*.⁹⁰ "Every word of wisdom, every useful thing by whomsoever discovered or planned,"⁹¹ is welcome. In no way should be discountenanced "the learned and able men who bring their industry and erudition, and, what is more, the wealth of the new discoveries, to the service of philosophy."⁹² The traditional doctrines are to be correlated with the teachings of other philosophers old and new.

⁸⁶Hubert Meuffels, "A propos d'un mot nouveau," *La Quinzaine* (Février, 1901), p. 527, quoted by M. de Wulf, *op. cit.*, p. 166.

⁸⁷"Aeterni Patris," in *The Great Encyclicals of Leo XIII*, p. 52.

⁸⁸*Loc. cit.*...

⁸⁹*Loc. cit.*

⁹⁰*Ibid.*, p. 56.

⁹¹*Ibid.*, p. 52.

⁹²*Ibid.*, p. 53; cf. *supra* note 84.

CHAPTER VIII

LEO XIII AND THOMISM

In the encyclical *Aeterni Patris* Leo XIII calls for the restoration of the Christian Philosophy which is Scholastic philosophy because this philosophy is in perfect harmony with the divinely revealed truths and developed in uninterrupted continuity from the start of Christianity. It is not the mere product of the spinning mind, but interpretation of reality itself, starting from, and remaining in, close contact with the facts themselves. *Veritas sequitur esse rerum*. Pius XII says the doctrines of the scholastic system "*Nituntur principiis ac notionibus ex vera rerum creaturarum cognitione deductis*."¹ Therefore, "daily experience, and the judgement of the greatest men, and, to crown all, the voice of the Church, have favored the scholastic philosophy."²

It is radically opposed to the "novel system of philosophy" with no regard for faith, invented by the "struggling innovators of the sixteenth century," having no unity since its "systems . . . multiplied beyond measures" and contain "conclusions differing and clashing one with another about those matters even which are the most important in human knowledge . . . A multi-form system of this kind, which depends on the authority and the choice of any professor, has a foundation open to change, and consequently gives us a philosophy not firm and stable, and robust like that of old, but tottering and feeble."³ It has no guaranty of truth, because it spins out its theories without regard for reality — "*petita dataque vicissim potestate quaelibet pro lubitu ingenioque excogitandi*."⁴

Having defined what he called "the sound and solid philosophy" the Pope left no doubt as to whom he considered the

¹"*Humani Generis*", A.A.S., XLII (1950), p. 566.

²"*Aeterni Patris*", in *The Great Encyclicals of Leo XIII*, p. 52.

³*Loc. cit.*, all quotations.

⁴*Leonis XIII, Pontif. Max Litterae Encyclicae* duobus primis sui pontificatus annis editae (Romae: Ex typographia Vaticana, 1880), p. 54.

guide through the imposing edifice of scholastic philosophy. Although there were a number of leading heads, clear, and genial minds, thorough thinkers, "*a providentissimo Dei numine excitata, per saeculorum decursum ingenia*,"⁵ who collaborated in its construction — "*profecto philosophia perennis immensae molis opus est*" — "among the scholastic doctors, the chief and master of all, towers Thomas Aquinas."⁶ This highly eulogistic statement is fully justified by the extraordinary doctrinal authority which Thomas possessed.

With Santiago Maria Ramirez⁷ we may divide the authority of St. Thomas in the field of philosophy into his intrinsic or scientific, and extrinsic or canonical and merely human authority. The intrinsic or scientific authority is "measured by the internal mental stature of the writer and the intrinsic doctrinal validity of his work." The extrinsic is "measured in a particular way by the approbation and commendation of the Teaching Church," and the evaluation and esteem of learned men.

Two elements compose the intrinsic or scientific authority of any philosopher: his personal qualities, which are partly natural endowment and partly acquired by personal effort; and his works, fruits of his talent and diligent effort, which explore, present and explain the different fields of reality in such a way as to give true insight and therefore constitute "perennially true and unassailably valid" teaching.

Now Thomas possessed an abundance of all the *personal* qualities requisite for a good philosopher: A razor-keen mind, "a spirit at once humble and swift... (and) lover of truth for its own sake;" a vivid, ready, and tenacious memory, a "surpassing genius;" tireless, purposeful, and unwearied diligence which readily paid the "cost of long labors and vigils" for the acquisition of new insight; a "life spotless throughout,"⁸

⁵Pius XII, "Allocution to the Third Thomistic Intern. Congress," A.S.S., XLII (1950), p. 734.

⁶"Aeterni Patris", *op. cit.*, p. 48.

⁷Santiago Ramirez, "The Authority of St. Thomas," *The Thomist*, XV (1 Jan., 1952), p. 2. P. Ramirez incorporated this article in a more extensive and complete form in his *Suma Teologica*, Vol. I, Introduccion general (Madrid: B.A.C., 1947), pp. 88-182.

⁸On the importance and influence of purity of life for the penetration of higher truths, see Appendix II.

full of reverence for the ancient doctors of the Church and respectful towards any contributor to the treasury of truth so that "he... in a certain way seems to have inherited the intellect of all. The doctrines of those illustrious men, like the scattered members of a body, Thomas collected together and cemented, distributed in wonderful order, and... increased with important additions."⁹ Or as Pius XII phrases the same truth:

Angelicus siquidem communisque Doctor Aquinas eos omnes, qui e superioribus aetatibus defluerunt sapientiae rivulos veluti mare in se recipiens, quidquid philosophando lucubrandoque humana ratio attigerat, id universum miro ordine luculentaque perspicuitate digestum superna luce ex Evangelio radianti composuit ordinavitque.¹⁰

Like the sun he illumined the world "with the splendor of his teaching" and "heated it with the ardor of his virtues."

Because truth was the passion and great idea of his life, St. Thomas sought for it wherever it offered itself. He studied all philosophical schools known at that time and fully acquainted himself with their philosophy. It was providential that precisely at that time the Greek texts of Greek philosophy came, via Constantinople, to the West, of which Thomas received accurate translations through his confrere William Moerbeke and Robert Grosseteste (see *supra* p. 88). Thus he had at his disposal the Greek, Latin, Jewish, and Arabic texts of Aristotle's works and the commentaries of them. It was not in a polemic spirit that he studied other authors but with the unprejudiced mind of the seeker for truth. The guiding principle for such study he laid down himself: "...in eligendis opinionibus vel repudiandis, non debet duci homo amore vel odio introducentis opinionem, sed magis ex certitudine veritatis,"¹¹ for it does not matter by whom a thing is said but rather what is said. The truth alone perfects the intellect. Its scope is as wide as reality itself. Therefore,

⁹"Aeterni Patris", I, c.

¹⁰A.A.S., XXIV (1942), p. 97.

¹¹*Commentaria in Metaphysicam Aristotelis*, lib. XII, lect. 9, n. 2566 (editio Marietti, 1935), p. 724.

philosophy has no part which he did not touch finely at once and thoroughly; on the laws of reasoning, on God and incorporeal substances, on man and other sensible things, on human actions and their principles, he reasoned in such a manner that in him there is wanting neither a full array of questions, nor an apt disposal of the varying parts, nor the best method of proceeding, nor soundness of principles or strength of argument, nor clearness and elegance of style, nor a facility for explaining what is abstruse.¹²

He had a lofty conception of the teaching profession, to which he devoted himself with complete thoroughness. Originality, progressiveness, and independence of old patterns mark his lectures. William of Tocco¹³ relates:

In his lectures he has new articles, a new and clear method of scientific inquiry and decision; in his reasonings he developed new arguments. No student, hearing him thus teach new doctrine and solve doubts and objections with new reasons, was left in doubt that God illuminated this thinker with new light.

Because he had such a high idea of, and clung with his whole soul and generous predilection to, academic teaching he declined to accept the archbishopric of Naples offered to him by Clement IV. The growth of his spiritual life kept pace with his growth of knowledge. We find in him a wonderful balance and proportion between "learning and research, reading and meditation, experimentation and abstraction, inductive and deductive reasoning, speculative and practical activity, as well as in the use of analyzing and synthesizing."¹⁴

The works of St. Thomas are astoundingly extensive and comprehensive, especially if we keep in mind that he lived scarcely fifty years, and much of his time was given to teaching and the exercises of the religious life. His attitude of mind towards his literary work is well expressed by Leo XIII who

¹²"Aeterni Patris", *op. cit.*, pp. 48-49.

¹³Grabmann, *Thomas von Aquin*. Verlag Josef Koesel & Friedrich Pustet, Muenchen, 1935, p. 16.

¹⁴S.M. Ramirez, *op. cit.*, p. 4.

writes: He "never gave himself to reading or writing without first begging the blessing of God," and "modestly confessed that whatever he knew he had acquired not so much by his own study and labor as by the divine gift."¹⁵

The aim of his academic-scientific life and endeavor Thomas saw in the deepest possible insight into the realm of the suprasensuous and supernatural truths, a comprehensive objective knowledge of the causes and principles, the laws and forces, the interdependence of phenomena in the natural and supernatural cosmos. The order of the universe is in some way to reflect itself in the soul. Aristotle already said "*animam esse quodammodo omnia, quia nata est omnia cognoscere. Et secundum hunc modum possibile est ut in una re totius universi perfectio existat. Unde haec est ultima perfectio ad quam anima potest pervenire, secundum philosophos, ut in ea describatur totus ordo universi, et causarum eius.*"¹⁶ For "*de rebus nobilissimis quantumcumque imperfecta cognitio maximam perfectionem animae confert.*"¹⁷ Leo XIII says:

The Angelic Doctor pushed his philosophic conclusions into the reasons and principles of the things which are most comprehensive and contain in their bosom, so to say, the seeds of almost infinite truths to be unfolded in good time by later masters and with a good yield.¹⁸

In order to reach his high aim, Thomas combined the historico-positive method with independent speculation wherein also ethico-religious viewpoints had some influence. The scientific individuality and originality of Thomas, therefore, is characterized by an independently speculative, logico-metaphysical trait, and positivo-historic viewpoint with a mystico-religious touch.¹⁹

Above all Thomas did logico-methodical, metaphysico-speculative thinking. His scientific activity is guided by strictly objective viewpoints, and exclusively determined by the idea of

¹⁵"Aeterni Patris," *op. cit.*, p. 57; cf. Grabmann, *op. cit.*, p. 35.

¹⁶S. Thomas, *De veritate*, q. 2, a 2, c.

¹⁷S. c. G., I, 5.

¹⁸"Aeterni Patris", *op. cit.*, p. 48.

¹⁹Cf. Grabmann, *op. cit.*, p. 39 f.

truth. He weighs what is said, not by whom it is said. "*Studium philosophiae non est ad hoc, quod sciatur quid homines senserint, sed qualiter se habeat veritas rerum.*"²⁰ Thomas, the researcher, follows the straight path of truth and tries to shed on the proposed problems as much light and clearness as possible. He accepts the achievements of previous philosophers, adds argument to argument, observation to observation, until the desired solution is found. He conscientiously separates true from sham knowledge, certainties from probabilities, definite results from hypotheses.

His love for truth was accompanied by an invincible courage of conviction. Whatever, according to his conviction, was true, he voiced and defended against any other position. No human authority, not even that of Aristotle or Augustin, could deflect him.

In his search for truth and clearness he evaded no difficulty. The Scholastic method of arraying all pros and cons, then taking a definite position, and solving the objections (*videtur quod — sed contra — corpus articuli — respondeo dicendum*) was for Thomas not a means of hairsplitting and quibbles, but a means of objective methodical doubt. In his *Summa contra Gentiles* and in the opuscula he puts the harness of Scholastic method aside and proceeds according to entirely free movements of thought and argument. Due to his disciplined thinking Thomas avoided all exaggeration.

His love for truth and clearness made Thomas expend "the greatest effort and care upon his work, subjecting his manuscript to the most exacting criticism three or four times. He used to revise words, phrases, arguments and whole chapters. He made corrections and changes and polished his work to produce it in the most accurate style and order."²¹ When on account of new researches and deeper reflection he found his previous views to be inadequate or even erroneous, he corrected, completed or retracted them.

In his scientific research Thomas masterfully combined ob-

²⁰St. Thomas, *De coelo*, I, lect. 22.

²¹S. Ramirez, *op. cit.*, p. 7. Cf. also his *Suma Theologica*, I, Introduction general, p. 73.

servation and speculation, analysis and synthesis, thus happily keeping the middle way between one-sided emphasis on positive facts, at the expense of the idea, and one-sided stress of the idea, at the expense of actual experience, between positivist empiricism and exaggerated idealism. A great amount of excellent psychological observation is laid down in his exposition of the passions. It was the positive facts of experience that made him, in his epistemology, follow Aristotle rather than the Franciscan school with its Augustinian views. His cosmological observations are less perfect than those of Albert the Great. But precious are his observations in his ethical, sociological, and political inquiries. Thomas never stops with observation and its facts. On the contrary, they are only the starting points for his investigation of the nature, causes, laws, and aims of the order of actual existence. Experience and observation serve metaphysical speculation. On his road of strictly logical and scientific thinking Thomas proceeds unswervingly, and consistently keeps his method; but he also excellently knows how to propose his thoughts and arguments in a lucid and transparent form. His didactic skill is beautifully indicated in the *prologus* to his *Summa Theologica* which itself is a gem of didactic ability.

His language corresponds to the sober objectivity of his method. His style is simple, precise, accurate, and distinct, without rhetorical pomp and poetical color, although warmth and depth of sentiment are not wanting in him as the Office of the Holy Eucharist testifies. But he is not after brilliant images, impressive and colorful expressions and phrases; he is after clear and distinct concepts.

Thomas not only did independent speculation, developed the full energy of the logician and metaphysician, but he also judiciously utilized the scientific achievements of previous ages. The universal character of Thomas' intellectual work can be compared, says O. Willmann,²² to a sea that absorbs all streams flowing from all sides, and lets sink whatever rubble they carry along, and thus effects the calm, clear surface in which the serene blue of the sky is mirrored. Whenever Thomas consults the past,

²²Otto Willmann, *Geschichte des Idealismus*, Vol. II (Braunschweig: Vieweg & Sohn, 1907), p. 458.

he completely absorbs and assimilates the borrowed materials, arranges them in a new setting and incorporates them into an independent and original structure so that his philosophical doctrine,

that is, the spirit of his system and its major propositions, cannot be called Platonic or Aristotelian or the offshoot of any other school. Rather it is thoroughly Christian and human in that it gives evidence of an organization of truths and principles towards which the human mind, naturally Christian, is inclined by nature. There is no system of philosophy which is so much a part of and conformable to nature, and at the same time so capable of perfecting the human mind as the philosophical system of Aquinas.²³

Particular weight is added to the scientific authority of St. Thomas by the determinate firmness with which he, as scarcely any other Scholastic, insists on the distinction of philosophy from theology without, however, creating a gap between them. Leo XIII points this out very precisely:

Clearly distinguishing, as is fitting, reason from faith, while happily associating the one with the other, he both preserved the rights and had regard for the dignity of each; so much so, indeed, that reason borne on the wings of Thomas to its human height, can scarcely rise higher, while faith could scarcely expect more or stronger aids from reason than those which she already obtained through Thomas.²⁴

Thomas' doctrinal authority culminates in his master-piece, the *Summa Theologica*, of which Card. Ehrle,²⁵ distinguished historian of the Middle Ages, writes: "As there is no scientific system which, as to universality and constancy of recognition, could compare to Scholasticism, so within Scholasticism there is no scientific achievement which could boast of such a success as the *Summa* of the Angelic Doctor has gained; its destiny is the destiny of the ecclesiastical science; the recognition accorded

²³S. Ramirez, *op. cit.*, p. 8.

²⁴"*Aeterni Patris*", *op. cit.*, p. 49.

²⁵*Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, XVIII (1880), p. 298.

to it by the Catholic schools is the gauge of the standard of theological and philosophical research."

To sum up: Simplicity, soundness, clearness, objectivity, sobriety, succinctness, vastness of extension, depth of comprehension, systematical arrangement, compact unity, harmony of the philosophical doctrines with the divinely revealed truths, which is the guaranty of its truth, energetic manner of explanation, and consistency of method of investigation give the philosophical system of St. Thomas the greatness, worth and efficacy and thus the highest scientific authority.

The *extrinsic* authority of St. Thomas derives, in a particular way, from the approbation and commendation by the Teaching Church and, as such, is called canonical; and from the valuation and estimation by learned men.

Absolutely speaking, philosophical doctrines as such do not fall under the direct jurisdiction of the Teaching Church, which primarily and directly is concerned only with the divinely revealed truths that constitute the deposit of faith. But "indirectly and by way of consequence" it extends also to philosophical matters. The deposit of faith must be communicated and interpreted to the faithful. But communication, acquisition and understanding of the supernatural truths is done by means of terms and concepts, definitions and distinctions borrowed from the natural sphere. Theology, the rational understanding of mysteries according to their inner logical connection and the drawing of conclusions from the revealed truths, depends in all these functions on philosophy, which it uses as its instrument. Therefore Pius XII declared that

the teaching authority of the Church . . . , by divine institution, assuredly has the mission not only to guard and interpret the deposit of divinely revealed truth but also to keep watch over the philosophical sciences themselves in order that Catholic dogmas may suffer no harm because of erroneous opinions.²⁶

The approbation and commendation of a philosophical doctrine by the Church is based on its intrinsic worth, particularly

²⁶"*Humani Generis*", A.A.S., XLII (1950), p. 575.

on its conformity with the truths of revelation. Therefore, the extrinsic authority presupposes the intrinsic worth, because in approving and commending the doctrine of an author "the Church does not create the force and truth of that doctrine out of nothing but supposes its existence and recognizes it, authoritatively proposing it to be followed and imitated."²⁷ The weight of such extrinsic authority depends on the dignity, excellence and competence of the approving and commending authority which in the case of the canonical actually is supreme.

Long is the list of the Supreme Pontiffs who directly or indirectly, by ordinary or solemn declaration praised, approved, and commended the doctrine of St. Thomas.

During his life time, Thomas was already honored by Popes Urban IV and Clement IV who, in appreciation of his talent and virtue, had him as theologian at the Papal Court. Gregory X called him to the Union Council of Lyons.

S. Ramirez sedulously collected all laudatory declarations of the Popes from the death of St. Thomas up to the present time. He distinguishes eight different periods: 1) From Thomas' death until his canonization (1274-1323); 2) From his canonization to his declaration as Doctor of the universal Church (1323-1567); 3) From this declaration until Leo XIII 1567-1878); 4) The Pontificate of Leo XIII (1878-1903); Thomas is declared Patron of all Catholic Schools (1880); 5) The Pontificate of Pius X (1903-1914). The *Motu Proprio* "Doctoris Angelici" and the Twenty-Four Thomist Theses (1914); 6) The Pontificate of Benedict XV (1914-1922). Canon Law and St. Thomas (1917); 7) Pius XI (1922-1939). St. Thomas and the Apostolic Constitution "Deus Scientiarum Dominus" (1931); 8) Pius XII and St. Thomas.²⁸

It was a holy rivalry that prompted the later Popes to add new attributes to the praises of the person and doctrine of St. Thomas by their predecessors.

It is true, though, that the Popes until Pius IX (1846-78) do not expressly and explicitly mention the philosophy of St. Tho-

²⁷S. Ramirez, *op. cit.*, p. 21.

²⁸Ramirez, *Suma Teologica*, I., Introduccion general, pp. 89-176.

mas, but his wisdom and excellence in general, and theology in particular. The reason for this is found in the fact that only with the beginning of the modern era has philosophy been divorced from theology and brought in opposition to revelation and theology. The consequences for society of this "novel system of philosophy" which was not based on reality and guided by truth as the only norm, but invented at pleasure and caprice, began to be seriously felt only in the later centuries. From the time when philosophy had "degenerated into a seminary of errors, and philosophers into artisans fashioning arguments against the true faith"²⁹, and in consequence of this the human race was oppressed by evils on every side, the need arose to protect reason and philosophy and call the minds back to the right method of philosophizing. Pius IX and all his successors eagerly and seriously concerned themselves with the restoration and renovation of the true, sound, and solid philosophy. They expressly and explicitly proposed the philosophy of St. Thomas as the ideal to follow, since in it Scholastic philosophy, the *philosophia perennis*, reached its peak of perfection.

Leo XIII enumerated eight of his predecessors³⁰ who "celebrated the wisdom of Thomas Aquinas by exceptional tributes of praise and the most ample testimonials" because

the universal Church borrows lustre from his admirable teaching . . . heresies, confounded and convicted by the same teaching, were dissipated and the whole world daily freed from fatal errors . . . most fruitful blessings have spread abroad from his writings over the whole Church, and . . . he is worthy of the honor which is bestowed on the greatest doctors of the Church, on Gregory and Augustine and Jerome.

To the judgments of these great Pontiffs on Thomas Aquinas comes, according to the opinion of Leo XIII, the crowning testimony of Innocent VI:

²⁹Ramirez, "The Authority of St. Thomas," *The Thomist*, XV (January, 1952), p. 47.

³⁰"*Aeterni Patris*", *op. cit.*, pp. 50-51: Clement VI (1342-52), Nicholas V (1328-30), Benedict XIII (1724-30), Pius V (1566-72), Urban V (136-70), Innocent XII (1691-1700), Benedict XIV 1740-58), Innocent VI (1352-62).

His teaching above that of others, the canons alone excepted, enjoys such an elegance of phraseology, a method of statement, a truth of proposition, that those who hold to it are never found swerving from the path of truth, and he who dares assail it will always be suspected of error.³¹

Considering, however, all that Leo XIII said and wrote and undertook in order to restore the philosophy of St. Thomas, it might well be said that the numerous and great praises which the Angelic Doctor received from the Supreme Pontiffs, so extraordinarily unanimous in this matter, reached a climax in Leo XIII: "*sicut sol crescit usque in perfectum diem, sic laudes doctrinae thomisticae a Sancta Sede semper augmento ditatae . . . ad summum venerunt*"³² per vocem Leonis, Supremi Ecclesiae Magistri.

Pius XI appraised this merit of Leo XIII:

It was to the great praise of Leo XIII that he restored Christian Philosophy, by stirring love for and cultivation of the Angelic Doctor. We will go farther and say that of all the things he did during his long Pontificate which were useful for the Church and for society, this restoration was of such importance that if he had done nothing else that alone would suffice to commend the name of so great a Pope to immortality.³³

Leo XIII has been rightly called the Pope of St. Thomas.

Another source from which the canonical authority of St. Thomas received weight, are the ecumenical councils "where blossoms the flower of all earthly wisdom." They always held Thomas in singular honor. Leo XIII enumerates five: The Council of Lyons (1274), of Vienna (1311-12), of Florence (1438-45), the Council of Trent, (1545-63) and the Vatican Council (1869-70). These Councils are especially mentioned because "one might say that" in them "Thomas took part and presided over the deliberations and decrees of the Fathers." In the Council of Trent Thomas earned a glory which none of the Catholic doctors

³¹*Ibid.*, p. 51.

³²Ramirez, *Suma Teologica*, I, p. 130.

³³A.A.S., XIV (1922), p. 454.

shared (with him) : "The Fathers . . . made it part of the order of the conclave to lay upon the altar, together with the code of Sacred Scripture and the decrees of the Supreme Pontiffs, the *Summa* of Thomas Aquinas, whence to seek counsel, reason, and inspiration."³⁴

In consequence of the publication of the encyclical "Aeterni Patris" numberless voices of the ordinary Teaching Office of the Church joined the declaration of the Supreme Pontiff. Cardinals and Patriarchs³⁵ Archbishops and Bishops³⁶ in so many variations extolled the absolute leadership of St. Thomas in the field of philosophy and theology. Superiors General of religious orders and congregations joined the hierarchy of the Church in conformity to their religious traditions since "nearly all the founders and framers of laws of the religious adhere to the teachings of St. Thomas, fearful lest any of them should swerve even in the slightest degree from the footsteps of so great a man."³⁷

The *merely human* extrinsic authority of an author depends upon the valuation and esteem of learned men and institutions. In this kind of authority, too, St. Thomas surpasses all. Complete universities, or particular faculties, academies, colleges, and lower schools; official institutions of learning and private study circles paid their tribute of honor to St. Thomas by studying his works, propagating and spreading his doctrines, or at least priding themselves in bearing his name. Leo XIII mentions as "celebrated schools and academies": Paris, Salamanca, Alcalá, Douay, Toulouse, Louvain, Padua, Bologna, Naples and Coimbra, and "many another." For "in those great homes of human wisdom, as in his own kingdom, Thomas reigned supreme; . . . the minds of all, of teachers as well as of taught, rested in wonderful harmony under the shield and authority of the Angelic Doctor."³⁸ To these names may be added Rome, Fribourg, Lima, Manila, Washington and Ottawa. Seminaries and colleges followed the lead of the universities.

³⁴"Aeterni Patris", *op. cit.*, p. 51.

³⁵Ramirez, *Suma Teologica*, I., Introduccion, p. 123 ff.

³⁶*Ibid.*, pp. 129 ff.

³⁷"Aeterni Patris", p. 49.

³⁸"Aeterni Patris", *op. cit.*, p. 50.

An unmistakable expression of an extraordinarily high valuation of St. Thomas are the International Thomistic Congresses, born of genuine esteem of St. Thomas and aimed at promoting in wider circles the influence of his teachings. World renowned men of highest competence because of excellent mastery of the works of St. Thomas and general scholarship meet here and co-operate in materializing the aim of the encyclical "Aeterni Patris".

The greatness of a man is measured not only by the number and worth of his followers, but also by the caliber of his adversaries. The unusual success of his lectures on the Sentences of Peter Lombard at Paris provoked the jealousy and opposition of professors from the secular clergy under the leadership of William of St. Amour and Henry of Ghent. By far of greater importance was the battle of St. Thomas against the Averroist Peripateticism defended by the members of the Parisian Faculty of Liberal Arts, whose main representatives were Siger of Brabant and Boëtius of Dacia. Thomas won the battle. His Christian Aristotelianism prevailed and Averroism was condemned on 10 December 1270 by the Bishop of Paris. But the condemnation of the Averroist Peripateticism cast its shade also on the Christian Peripateticism of Albert the Great and Thomas. For some time already this trend of Thomas had aroused the suspicion of strictly conservative theologians of the secular clergy and especially of the Franciscan Order. The main point of attack was Thomas' doctrine of the unity of the substantial form in man. John Peckham led the opposition in the Franciscan school. This opposition of the conservative Augustinianism to the progressive Aristotelianism of Thomas assumed more acute forms after the death of Thomas. Already on 7 March 1277, Stephan Tempier, Bishop of Paris, condemned nine propositions of Thomas, among them the doctrine on the principle of individuation. This opposition of Franciscan Augustinianism against Thomist Aristotelianism was continued by the Scotist school, the transition to which is represented by William of Ware. Foremost among the adversaries in the Scotist school were Duns Scotus himself, the perpetual critic of St. Thomas, and William de la Mare, the author of the *Correctorium Fratris Thomae*.

But even members of his own order, like Robert Kilwardby, fiercely opposed the trend of thought of Thomas. Robert Kilwardby, archbishop of Canterbury, followed the example of the bishop of Paris and condemned on 18 March 1277 several propositions, among which were also such of St. Thomas. The fiercest Dominican opponent of Thomas was Durandus of St. Pourcain (d. 1332).

But this opposition to Thomism was as short-lived as it was violent; the advocates and defenders of Thomas stood like a wall against the opponents. All the battles, instead of diminishing the influence of Thomas, increased his authority, winning him more numerous and more powerful friends.³⁹

Leo XIII himself sees in the opposition to Thomas a powerful argument for the saint's authority when he writes:

A last triumph was reserved for this incomparable man — namely, to compel the homage, praise, and admiration of even the very enemies of the Catholic name. For it has come to light that there were not lacking among the leaders of heretical sects some who openly declared that, if the teaching of Thomas Aquinas were only taken away they could easily battle with all Catholic teachers, gain the victory, and abolish the Church (Besa, Bucerus). A vain hope indeed, but no vain testimony.⁴⁰

At all times Thomas had numberless advocates and enthusiastically devoted friends and followers among the best minds. D. J. Kennedy⁴¹ writes:

An attempt to give names of Catholic writers who have expressed their appreciation of St. Thomas and of his influence would be an impossible undertaking; for the list would include nearly all who have written on philosophy or theology since the thirteenth century, as well as hundreds of writers on other subjects.

³⁹Cf. Grabmann, *op. cit.*, pp. 14 ff; 64 ff. Ramirez, *op. cit.*, pp. 93 ff. Ueberweg, *Geschichte der Philosophie*, II, 12. Auflage (Graz: Akademische Druck- und Verlagsanstalt, 1951), pp. 480 ff.

⁴⁰"Aeterni Patris", *op. cit.*, pp. 51-52.

⁴¹*The Catholic Encyclopedia*, XIV, "Thomas", p. 673.

But even in non-Catholic camps Thomas has admirers; a splendid example is Mortimer J. Adler in the United States. Leading non-Catholic universities in the United States have established courses in Scholastic philosophy. Anglicans have deep admiration for St. Thomas. Especially since the days of Pusey and Newman, St. Thomas has been in high repute at the University of Oxford. The reason for this is, as F. van Steenberghen⁴² says: "Thomism is a strict philosophical system, well able to face up to the most brilliant systems of modern philosophy." And Mercier:⁴³

Amid the almost uninterrupted disintegration of systems during the last three centuries, the philosophy of St. Thomas has alone been able to stand the shock of criticism; it alone has proved sufficiently solid and comprehensive to serve as an intellectual basis and unifying principle for all the new facts and phenomena brought to light by the modern sciences.

In view of this supreme intrinsic and extrinsic authority of St. Thomas it is but logical that Leo XIII had as his "first and most cherished idea that. . . a generous and copious supply" should be furnished "to studious youth of those crystal rills of wisdom flowing in a never ending and fertilizing stream from the fountain-head of the Angelic Doctor"⁴⁴ In all earnestness he, therefore, exhorts "to restore the golden wisdom of St. Thomas, and to spread it far and wide for the defense and beauty of the Catholic faith, for the good of society, and for the advantage of all the sciences."⁴⁵ The bishops should "let carefully selected teachers endeavor to implant the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas in the minds of students, and set forth clearly his solidity and excellence over others."⁴⁶

The first audience Leo XIII gave to Mercier was characteristic of his own attitude towards Thomism. The Pontiff asked the proposed candidate for the chair of Thomistic philosophy

⁴²*Epistemology*, (New York: Wagner, 1949), p. ix.

⁴³See *supra*, chapt. VI n. 3.

⁴⁴"*Aeterni Patris*", *op. cit.*, p. 53.

⁴⁵*Ibid.*, p. 56.

⁴⁶*Loc. cit.*

at Louvain with a determined and penetrating voice: "*Est-ce que vous aimez saint Thomas?*" *Ex abundantia cordis os loquitur*. Leo XIII was an enthusiastic friend, a fervent and foremost advocate of Thomas and resolutely worked for the restoration of Scholastic philosophy under the leadership of Thomas. He positively and unmistakably favored and held to Thomism, that is, the philosophical system elaborated by St. Thomas on the groundwork of evident and certain principles which he, in strictly logical order, developed to the last consequences; or, in the words of Pius XII, the system wherein from principles Thomas "*ad conclusiones progreditur; metaphysica principia, quae sunt omnibus aetatibus commune christianae sapientiae patrimonium, usque ad extrema consecraria placide et tuto enucleando deduxit.*"⁴⁷

Leo XIII means the true and genuine Thomism. He seriously warns:

Lest the false for the true or the corrupt for the pure be drunk in, be ye watchful that the doctrine of Thomas be drawn from his own fountains or at least from those rivulets which derived from the very fount, have thus far flowed, according to the established agreement of learned men, pure and clear; be careful to guard the minds of youth from those which are said to flow thence, but in reality are gathered from strange and unwholesome streams.⁴⁸

KINDS OF THOMISM.

Two different kinds of Thomism certainly do not conform to the idea of Leo XIII: both are extremes which fail, the one by excess, the other by defect.

The first, an exaggerated or servile Thomism, is too narrow in view, and slavish in attitude. It adheres to each and every letter of Thomas in a way which Thomas himself would strongly disapprove. It accepts everything that Thomas wrote,

⁴⁷Allocution to the 3rd Thomistic Intern. Congr., A.A.S., XLII (1950), p. 735.

⁴⁸"*Aeterni Patris*", *op. cit.*, pp. 56-57.

because Thomas wrote it, and nothing beyond it. It would not give up superseded statements or solutions; nor would it solve modern problems in the light of the principles of Thomas, but would search his writings for ready made solutions of any problem, even such of our days. Any attempt at incorporating and absorbing into the system of Thomas new achievements, at developing and enlarging the doctrinal edifice of Thomas, it considers an adulteration of Thomas. For it the doctrinal system of Thomas is a closed book, already enriched with every perfection so that there is no need of any development either in ideas or in phraseology. Such Thomists fail to distinguish between principles and conclusions, essentials and accessories, elements of the Thomistic doctrinal synthesis that are of primary, and those that are of secondary importance only. Consequently, they exclude all freedom of thought, judgment, and investigation. Thomas is the only authority. The defenders of this Thomism are guided "*par dévotion aveugle et sentimentale pour saint Thomas, ce qui est une manière sotté et funeste de le défendre et de le cultiver.*"⁴⁹

This kind of Thomism is contrary to the concept of philosophy held by Thomas, and the conception of Thomism held by Leo XIII. According to Thomas it does not matter by whom a thing is said, but what is said.

It seems natural to human reason to advance gradually from the imperfect to the perfect. Hence, in speculative sciences, we see that the teaching of the early philosophers was imperfect, and that it was afterwards perfected by those who succeeded them. So also in practical matters.⁵⁰

Moreover, no one by his own thinking can find out all that pertains to wisdom and therefore, no one is so wise that he cannot learn from another.⁵¹

And in this way, additions are made to knowledge (*addimenta in artibus*). In the beginning a little bit was discovered, then, later through different people it gradually increased into a great

⁴⁹J. M. R. Villeneuve, "La vraie culture thomiste," Extrait de la *Revue de l'Université d'Ottawa*, livraison d'octobre-décembre 1936), p. 2.

⁵⁰*S. Th.*, Ia IIae, q. 97, a.

⁵¹In *Ps.* 43, no. I, quoted by Ramirez, "The authority of St. Thomas." *The Thomist*, XV (Jan. 1952), p. 90, n. 314.

quantity; for it is everyone's concern to add what is lacking in the knowledge (*consideratione*) of the predecessors.⁵²

The view of Leo XIII is expressed in different documents.⁵³

The other extreme, which fails by defect, is a kind of eclecticism; it may be called Thomism by name only. Its representatives make frequent use of the name of St. Thomas and like to quote richly from his works. But as Card. Villeneuve,⁵⁴ archbishop of Quebec, says:

On pourra reprendre tous nos problèmes, et chercher dans la Somme et les autres ouvrages du saint Docteur ce qu'il conteste de cela. Sera-t-on thomiste? Un peu, *materialiter loquendo*. . . Le thomisme est moins fait de conclusions, si riches et si solides soient-elles, que de principes et d'une methode qui en font toute la force. Diverse sentences de saint Thomas, surtout en matière de science positive ou de doctrines occasionnelles, peuvent apparaître maintenant caduques, discutables, erronées. Le saint Docteur serait le premier à en sourire et à les classer en un dictionnaire de *Rétractions*. Mais le thomisme qui demeure, plus indestructible que le roc, ce sont les principes majeurs, c'est la methode, qui forment le corps et la charpente de son œuvre. Car tout ceci est aussi immuable que la raison humaine elle-même.

There are, however, representatives of a tendency who led by a false idea of fraternal charity, seek to harmonize all systems of philosophy. Since Leo XIII and all popes after him declared that they hold to Thomism, these representatives would accept Thomism, but not be too explicit in contradicting doctrines opposed to Thomism. "*Concilions, Butinons. Gardons un peu de tout.*" According to them, the fundamental principles of the Thomist doctrines are those accepted by all philosophers in the Church. All other points, even such as expressed by the

⁵²*In decem libros ethicorum Aristotelis ad Nicom.*, lect. XI, n. 133.

⁵³See for quotations from Leo XIII and later Popes, Ramirez, "The authority . . .", pp. 90 ff.

⁵⁴*Op. cit.*, p. 2.

⁵⁵Hellin, "Sana libertad de la filosofia escolastica en la enciclica "Humani Generis" y en otros documentos ecclesiasticos," *Pensamiento*, XXIX (Enero-Marzo, 1952), p. 64.

twenty-four theses,⁵⁵ on which Thomas is not in accord with other masters are of secondary importance, or even subtleties which it is wise to ignore.

The proximate cause of this tendency, or at least, the occasion of its development, seems, according to the Cardinal,⁵⁶ to be the following fact: Leo XIII and Pius X, at repeated times, demanded that the seminaries and Catholic universities follow the method and the principles of St. Thomas. Consequently all Catholic authors, even the most opposed among them, have tried "*per fas vel nefas*" not to agree with the Angelic Doctor, but to make him agree with their own teachings, "*et pour ce de le cuisiner à leur sauce et à leur façon.*" The most opposite consequences have been drawn from the writings of the *Doctor communis*; and this caused an incredible confusion about his doctrine, which thus appeared to students to be a hodge podge and a heap of contradictions. No greater injustice to the man of whom Leo XIII wrote "that reason, borne on the wings of Thomas to its human height, can scarcely rise higher."⁵⁷ That is also the reason for the belief that all points on which the Catholic philosophers do not agree by this very fact become doubtful. In order to give Thomas the honor of not being contradicted by anyone, it was finally concluded to allow him to have as his own doctrine only what all Catholics agree on, that means, what the Church has defined and what must be held to safeguard the faith. This is eclecticism, which often gives itself the label of true Thomism, but is, in fact, only a "decapitated" Thomism.

To this kind of Thomism seem to belong the holders of the following view:

Si se tiene gran estima y veneracion de la excelsa figura de Santo Tomas; si se estiman sus obras en lo que merecen; si se procura entender sus enseñanzas, y se le sigue en lo que es fundamental para la razon y la fe, ya uno es suficientemente tomista en el sentido que quiere la Iglesia, aunque no lo sea en el sentido mas estrecho, que consistira en seguir las

⁵⁶*Op. cit.*, pp. 10-11.

⁵⁷"*Aeterni Patris*", *op. cit.*, p. 49.

doctrinas exclusivas de Santo Tomas, y que son negadas o puestas en duda por otros autores catolicos insignes: en estas cosas la Iglesia quiere y desea que haya plena libertad y no quiere en modo alguna a imponer a nadie la obligacion de seguirlo.⁵⁸

The Thomism to which Leo XIII holds, keeps the golden middle between the two extremes. It is the system of St. Thomas in its entirety as it proceeds from his evident principles and comprises all derived truths in compact unity, amended from everything which is at variance with the evident results of the progress meanwhile made, and enriched by all new sound and good thoughts.⁵⁹ The true Thomism possesses the power to assimilate all the elements of truth to be found in other systems because of the elevation and universality of its principles.⁶⁰

⁵⁸Hellin, *op. cit.*, p. 55.

⁵⁹"Aeterni Patris," *op. cit.*, p. 56.

⁶⁰On the assimilative power of Thomism, cf. Garrigou-Lagrange *Reality*, (St. Louis: B. Herder Book Co., 1950), pp. 346 ff. Rommen, *The State in Catholic Thought* (St. Louis: Herder, 1950), p. 79.

CONCLUSION

The new Scholasticism is the restoration of Scholastic philosophy in its generic sense: the revival of the philosophical ideas of the Middle Ages, and their development in the light of modern times. It has all that is best in medieval Scholasticism, enriched and completed by modern science and adapted to the needs of our times. According to the advice of Leo XIII "that every word of wisdom, every useful thing by whomsoever discovered or planned, ought to be received with a willing and grateful mind," the new Scholasticism accepts the patrimony of truths bequeathed to it by all those who have gone before us and increases and adapts it to the needs of the present times.

It is here maintained that Leo XIII welcomed, approved, encouraged, and advanced the movement of the new Scholasticism. At the same time it is asserted that Leo positively and expressly favored, recommended, and urged Thomism. In fact, it was he who, as Mercier says, "imparted to the neo-Thomist movement an all round stimulus and gave it its true bearing."¹

Now, Thomism and Scholasticism are not identical terms. Thomas is a scholastic philosopher, but not all that is Scholastic is also Thomistic: there are differences between views of St. Thomas and views of other scholastics.

Is it not, therefore, contradictory to uphold that Leo XIII approved and promoted both the new Scholasticism and Thomism? Are both objectives compatible? Is there no repugnance between them?

As was already stated, Scholasticism represents the collective inheritance of the majority of the thinkers of the West who were in agreement on fundamental and essential questions. In this regard, then, there can be no opposition between Scholasticism and Thomism, the new Scholasticism and Thomism. On the contrary, the study of the individual syntheses of the leading Scholastic doctors and their comparison among them-

¹*The Origins of Contemporary Psychology* (London: R. & T. Washbourne, Ltd., 1918), p. 326.

selves and with the synthesis of St. Thomas must logically lead to Thomism, since his system is the most complete and most consistently arranged expression of Scholasticism, its ripest fruit.

Moreover, St. Thomas represents the peak of Scholasticism. He collected and incorporated into his system whatever truth had been elaborated by thinkers up to his time. On the other hand, the new Scholasticism is not a servile reproduction of the teachings of the Middle Ages, but a judiciously selective acceptance of its principles and such conclusions as are compatible with the evident achievements of our time.

In really controversial questions, Leo XIII, faithfully keeping to the tradition of the Church, wished freedom of scientific research to be safeguarded. This, however, could not be done if Thomism were imposed as an exclusive system. Actually, Thomism was given a decided preference by Leo XIII.

Upon a close examination of the encyclical "Aeterni Patris" the following distinction suggests itself: We may distinguish between the study of philosophy on the level of students who make the first acquaintance with philosophy, receive the necessary philosophical equipment whereby the minds are set on a definite road, and students on the level of research, whose minds are already prepared and equipped and hence in a position to judge ideas and theories.

Now Thomist philosophy is ideal for initiating students into the realm of philosophy. It possesses principles which are expressions of common sense, principles towards which, therefore, the human mind is naturally inclined. There is no system of philosophy which is so much a part of, and so conformable to, nature, and at the same time so capable of forming and perfecting the human mind as the philosophical system of Thomas.

Therefore Leo XIII urged that the *youth* engaged in study should be given largely and abundantly the pure streams of wisdom which flow from the Angelic Doctor as from a perennial and copious spring.² Carefully chosen teachers should instill the doctrine of Thomas Aquinas in the *minds of their hearers*. The bishops were to be responsible for the careful choice

²"Aeterni Patris", *op. cit.*, pp. 56-57.

of the teachers. This responsibility concerns especially the choice of the teachers for their seminaries, where young people study and receive their first philosophical instruction and training. The bishop should be careful to guard the *minds of the youth* from those doctrines which are said to flow from the writings of St. Thomas, but in reality are gathered from strange and unwholesome streams. Thomism is the philosophy for all institutions where the first contact with philosophy takes place; students should receive nothing but the best and the safest of instruction in order to protect their receptive minds from contamination and a wrong initiation.

On the level of research, as in the case of the Roman Academy of St. Thomas or the *Institut Supérieur de Louvain* or the *Société Philosophique de Louvain* or any learned association, the objective of the new Scholasticism is proposed (cfr. *supra*, p. 185).

The relation of the new Scholasticism to Thomism, therefore, is such that a thorough study of the new Scholasticism will naturally and logically lead to a deep appreciation of, and faithful adherence to, Thomism.³

³For a study of the nature of the obligations to adhere and to follow the admonitions and commands of the Holy See concerning the philosophy of St. Thomas, see the articles of S. Ramirez, "The authority of St. Thomas, *The Thomist*, XV (January, 1952); A. Bandera, "Pío XII y Santo Tomas," *La Ciencia Tomista*, CCXL-CCXLI (1951), pp. 483-543; Hellin, "Sana libertad de la filosofía escolástica en la encíclica 'Humani Generis' y en otros documentos eclesíasticos," *Pensamiento*, XXIX (Enero-Marzo, 1952), pp. 53-73.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

A. BOOKS

- Altaner, Berthold. *Patrologie*. Freiburg im Breisgau 1938.
- Bandas, Rudolph G. *Contemporary Philosophy and Thomistic Principles*. N.Y. 1932.
- Baur, Ludwig. *Metaphysik*. Second edition. Muenchen 1932.
- Brunsmann, Johannes. *Die philosophischen Voraussetzungen unserer Gottesbeweise*. Moedling bei Wien 1935.
- Bittle, Celestine N. *The Science of Correct Thinking*. Milwaukee, 1937.
- . *From Aether to Cosmos*. Milwaukee 1947
- . *The Domain of Being*. Milwaukee 1947
- . *God and His Creatures*. Milwaukee 1953.
- . *Man and Morals*. Milwaukee 1950.
- . *Reality and the Mind*. Milwaukee 1939.
- . *The Whole Man*. Milwaukee 1945.
- Boedder, Bernard. *Natural Thology*. Second edition. N.Y. and London 1927.
- Brennan, Robert Edward. *Thomistic Psychology*. New York 1941.
- Brugger, Walter. *Philosophisches Woerterbuch*. Third edition. Freiburg 1950.
- Bruni Gerardo (translated by John S. Zyburá). *Progressive Scholasticism*. St. Louis and London 1929.
- Coffey, Peter. *The Science of Logic*. 2 vols. New York 1938.
- . *Epistemology or The Theory of Knowledge*. 2 vols. New York 1938.
- . *Ontology or The Theory of Being*. New York 1938.
- Coffey, Reginald M. *The Man from Rocca Sicca*. Milwaukee 1943.
- Copleston, Frederick. *A History of Philosophy*. Vol. I: *Greece and Rome*, 1948. Vol. II: *Mediaeval Philosophy, Augustine to Scotus*, 1950. Westminster, Md.
- . Vol. III: *Ockham to Suarez*. London 1953.
- De Brie, G.A. (ed.). *Bibliographia Philosophica, 1934-1945*. Vol. I: *Bibliographia Historiae Philosophiae*. Ultrajecti ad Rhenum 1950.
- De Raeymaeker, Louis. *Introduction to Philosophy*. New York 1949.
- . *The Philosophy of Being: A Synthesis of Metaphysics*. St. Louis 1954.
- De Wulf, Maurice. *Scholasticism Old and New*. Translated by P. Coffey. Dublin 1907.
- . *History of Mediaeval Philosophy*. 2 vols. New York 1926.
- . *History of Mediaeval Philosophy*. Vol. I. Definitive translation of the sixth French edition by E. C. Messenger. London 1952.
- Dominguez, Dionisio. *Historia de la Filosofia*. Quinta edicion, retocada y aumentada. Santander 1946.
- Dominican Fathers of the Province of St. Joseph, (eds.). *The Maritain Volume of the Thomist*. New York 1943.

- Ehrle, Franz, Card. *Die Scholastik und ihre Aufgaben in unserer Zeit*. Freiburg im Breisgau 1932.
- Endres, J. A. *Einleitung in die Philosophie*. Third edition. Muenchen 1923.
- Ettlinger, Max. *Geschichte der Philosophie von der Romantik bis zur Gegenwart*. Muenchen 1924.
- Ferm, Vergilius (ed.). *A History of Philosophical Systems*. New York 1950.
- Feuling, Daniel. *Hauptfragen der Metaphysik*. Salzburg-Leipzig 1936.
- . *Ontologia*. Editio septima. Friburgi Brisgoviae 1934.
- Garrigou-Lagrange Reginald. *God: His Existence and His Nature*. Vol. I: *The Existence of God*. Vol. II: *The Nature of God and His Attributes*. St. Louis 1934.
- . *Reality*. St. Louis and London 1950.
- Beatitude*. St. Louis 1956.
- Gilson, Etienne. *The Philosophy of St. Thomas Aquinas*. St. Louis and London 1937.
- . *The Spirit of Mediaeval Philosophy*. New York 1940.
- . *The Unity of Philosophical Experience*. New York 1950.
- . *God and Philosophy*. New Haven 1941.
- . *History of Christian Philosophy in the Middle Ages*. London 1955.
- Frick, Carolus. *Logica*. Editio septima. Friburgi Brisgoviae 1931.
- Grahmann, Martin. *Geschichte der scholastischen Methode*, Freiburg im Breisgau 1909.
- Vol. I: *Die scholastische Methode von ihren ersten Anfängen in der Vaeterliteratur bis zum Beginn des 12. und beginnenden 13. Jahrhunderts*. Freiburg i. Br.: 1911.
- . *Die theolog. Erkenntnis- und Einleitungslehre des hl. Thomas von Aquin*. Freiburg in der Schweiz 1948.
- . *Thomas von Aquin. Eine Einfuehrung in seine Persoenlichkeit und Gedankenwelt*. Sechste Auflage; Muenchen 1935. Spanish translation by A. Menendez-Reigada. Salamanca 1918.
- . *Introduction to the Theological Summa of St. Thomas*. Translated by John S. Zybur. St. Louis 1930.
- Gredt, Josephus, *Elementa Philosophiae Aristotelico-Thomisticae*. 2 vols. Seventh edition. Vol. I: *Logica — Philosophia Naturalis*. Vol. II: *Metaphysica — Ethica*. Friburgi Brisgoviae 1932.
- Hart, Charles A. (ed.). *Aspects of the New Scholastic Philosophy*. New York 1932.
- Hergenroether, Joseph Card. *Handbuch der allgemeinen Kirchengeschichte*. 3 vols. Revised edition by Johann Peter Kirsch. Vol. I, fifth edition, 1911. Vol. II, fourth edition, 1904. Vol. III, fourth edition, 1909. Friburgi Br.
- Hugon, Rdo. P. Eduardo. *Las Veinticuatro Tesis Tomistas*. Almagro. 1924.
- Joad, C.E.M. *Guide to Philosophy*. New York 1946.
- Joyce, George Hayward. *Principles of Logic*. Third edition. London 1949.
- Kleutgen, Joseph. *Die Philosophie der Vorzeit*. 2 vols. Innsbruck 1878.

- Klimke, Federico. *Historia de la Filosofia*. Barcelona 1947.
- Lehmen, Alfons. *Lehrbuch der Philosophie*. 4 vols.
 Vol. I: *Logik, Kritik und Ontologie*. Third edition. 1909.
 Vol. II: *Kosmologie und Psychologie*. Second edition. 1905.
 Vol. III: *Theodizee*. Second edition. 1906.
 Vol. IV, *Moralphilosophie*. Second edition. 1909. Freiburg. Br.
- Liberatore, Matthaeus. *Institutiones Philosophicae*. Prati: 1881. Vol. I, *Logica et metaphysica generalis*.
- Leo XIII. *The Great Encyclical Letters of Leo XIII*. New York 1903.
- Manser, Gallus M. *Das Wesen des Thomismus*. 3rd ed. Freiburg in der Schweiz 1949.
- Maquart, F. X. *Elementa Philosophiae*. 3 vols. Paris 1938.
- Maritain, Jacques. *An Introduction to Philosophy*. London 1937.
- . *Distinguish to Unite, or The Degrees of Knowledge*. New York 1959.
- . *Existence and the Existent*. New York 1949.
- . *Man and the State*. Chicago 1951.
- . *Philosophy of Nature*. New York. This volume contains also *Maritain's Philosophy of the Sciences* by Yves R. Simon.
- . *A Preface to Metaphysics*, New York 1948.
- Markovics, Robert. *Grundsätzliche Vorfragen einer methodischen Thomasdeutung*. Roma 1956.
- Marx, J. *Lehrbuch der Kirchengeschichte*. Eighth edition. Trier 1922.
- McCormick, John F. *Scholastic Metaphysics*. 2 vols.
 Vol. I: *Being, Its Divisions and Causes*. Chicago. 1928.
 Vol. II: *Natural Theology*. Chicago, 1928.
- McKeon, Richard (ed.). *The Basic Works of Aristotle*. New York 1949.
- Menendez Y Pelayo, Marcelino. *La Ciencia Española*. 3 vols. Buenos Aires 1947.
- Mercier, Cardinal. *The Origins of Contemporary Psychology*. London 1918.
- . *Modernism*. London 1912.
- Mercier, Cardinal, and others. *A Manual of Modern Scholastic Philosophy*. Third (English) edition. London 1928.
- Messner, Johannes. *Das Naturrecht*. Handbuch der Gesellschaftsethik, Staatsethik und Wirtschaftsethik. Fourth edition. Innsbruck-Wien-Muenchen 1960.
- Das Gemeinwohl. Idee, Wirklichkeit, Aufgaben*. Osnabrueck 1962.
- Metzke, Erwin. *Handlexikon der Philosophie*. Heidelberg 1949.
- Meyer, Hans. *Geschichte der Alten Philosophie*. Muenchen 1925.
- Moore, Thomas Verner. *The Driving Forces of Human Nature and Their Adjustment*. New York 1948.
- Nys, D. *Cosmology*. 2 vols. Milwaukee 1942.
- Olgiati Msgr. Francesco, transl. by John S. Zyburá. *The Key to the Study of St. Thomas*. Second revised edition. St. Louis and London 1929.
- O'Reilly, Bernard. *Life of Leo XIII*. London 1903.
- Pastor, Ludwig. *Geschichte der Paepste*. 16 vols. Freiburg im Breisgau 1931.
- Pegis, Anton C. *Essays in Modern Scholasticism*. Westminster, Md. 1944.

- Pesch, Tillmanus. *Institutiones Philosophiae Naturalis*. 2 vols. Editio altera. Friburgi Brisgoviae 1897.
- . *Institutiones Logicae et Ontologicae*. 2 vols. Editio altera (Carolo Frick).
Vol. I: *Introductio in Philosophiam — Logica*, 1914.
Vol. II: *Ontologia sive Metaphysica Generalis*, 1919.
- Phillips, R. P. *Modern Thomistic Philosophy*. 2 vols. Westminster, Md. 1935.
Vol. I: *The Philosophy of Nature*.
Vol. II: *Metaphysics*.
- Pieper, Josef. *Die Wirklichkeit und das Gute*. Leipzig 1935.
- . *The Silence of St. Thomas*. London 1957.
- . *Leisure the Basis of Culture*. London 1958.
- . *Scholasticism. Personalities and Problems of Medieval Philosophy*. London 1960
- Ramirez, Santiago Maria. *Summa Teologica de Santo Tomás de Aquino*. Tomo I: *Intrôduccion General*. Madrid 1957.
- Remer, Vincentius. *Ontologia*. Editio Nona a Paulo Geny. Romae 1947.
- Renard, Henri. *The Philosophy of Being*. Second edition. Milwaukee 1946.
- . *The Philosophy of Man*. Milwaukee 1948.
- Rommen, Heinrich A. *The Natural Law*. Translated by R. Henley. St. Louis 1948.
- . *The State in Catholic Thought*. St. Louis 1950.
- Runes, Dagobert D. *The Dictionary of Philosophy*. New York 1942.
- Scheeben, J. M. *Die Mysterien des Christentums*. Mainz 1931.
- . *The Mysteries of Christianity*. Translated by Cyril Vollert. St. Louis 1947.
- Scheuber, Joseph (ed.). *Kirche und Reformation*. Einsiedeln 1917.
- Schmidlin, Josef. *Papstgeschichte der neuen Zeit*. 2 vols. Muenchen 1934.
- Schwertschlagel, J. *Philosophie der Natur*. 2 vols. Second edition 1922.
Vol. I: *Natur und Koerper im allgemeinen*.
Vol. II: *Die einzelnen Klassen der Koerper im besonderen*. Muenchen.
- . *Die Sinneserkenntnis*. Muenchen 1924.
- Seppelt-Loeffler. *Papstgeschichte*. Muenchen 1933.
- Sertillanges, A.D. *Der hl. Thomas von Aquin*. Hellerau 1928.
- Sheen, Fulton J. *Philosophy of Religion*. New York 1948.
- Steffes, Johann Peter. *Relgionsphilosophie*. Muenchen 1925.
- Stein, Edith. *Endliches und Ewiges Sein*. Freiburg 1950.
- Steinbuechel, Theodor. *Die philosophische Grundlegung der katholischen Sittenlehre*. Duesseldorf 1951.
- Stoeckl, Albert. *Lehrbuch der Philosophie*. 3 vols. Sixth revised edition. Mainz 1887.
Vol. I: *Einleitung in die Philosophie, psychologische Dynamilogie, Logik und Erkenntnisstheorie*.
Vol. II: *Metaphysik*.
Vol. III: *Ethik, Social-und Rechtsphilosophie*.
- . *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*. Fourth edition by Georg Weingaertner. Mainz 1924.

- Teresia Renata de Spiritu Sancto. *Edith Stein*. Nuerenberg 1948.
- Thomas Aquinas. *Summa Theologica*. Cura et studio Sac. Petri Caramello 1948.
- . *De Ente et Essentia*. Taurini 1932.
- . *De Veritate*, ed. Marietti 1953.
- . *In decem libros Ethicorum Aristotelis ad Nicomachum* 1949.
- . *In Metaphysicam Aristotelis Commentaria*. Taurini 1935.
- . *Summa Contra Gentiles*. Torino 1946.
- Strigl, Anton. *Die tragische Schuld der Spact- u. Neuscholastik*. Wien 1953.
- Turner, William. *History of Philosophy*. Boston 1903, 1929.
- Ueberweg, Friedrich. *Grundriss der Geschichte der Philosophie*. Graz.
- Vol. I: Karl Praechter (ed.). *Die Philosophie des Altertums*, 1953.
- Vol. II: Bernhard Geyer, (ed.). *Die patristische und scholastische Philosophie*, 1951.
- Vol. III: Max Frischeisen-Koehler u. Willy Moog, (ed.). *Die Philosophie der Neuzeit bis zum Ende des XVIII Jahrhunderts*, 1953.
- Vol. IV: Traugott Konstantin Oesterreich, (ed.). *Die deutsche Philosophie des XIX Jahrhunderts und der Gegenwart*, 1951.
- Vol. V: Traugott Konstantin Oesterreich, (ed.). *Die Philosophie des Auslandes vom Beginn des 19. Jahrhunderts bis auf die Gegenwart*, 1953.
- Vallet, P. *Histoire de la Philosophie*. Deuxième edition. 1882.
- Van Steenberghen, Fernand. *Epistemology*. New York 1949.
- . *Ontology*. Translated by M. J. Flynn. 1952.
- Van Weddingen, Alois. *L'encyclique de S.S. Léon XIII et la Restauration de la Philosophie Chretienne*. 3me edition. Paris 1880.
- Vries, Joseph de. *Denken und Sein*. Freiburg im Breisgau 1937.
- Willman, Otto. *Geschichte des Idealismus*. 2. Auflage;
- Vol. I: *Vorgeschichte und Geschichte des antiken Idealismus*
- Vol. II: *Der Idealismus der Kirchenvaeter u. der Realismus der Scholastiker*
- Vol. III: *Der Idealismus der Neuzeit*. Braunschweig 1907.
- Wittman, Michael. *Ethik*. Muenchen 1923.
- Wust, Peter. *Gestalten und Gedanken*. Muenchen 1940.
- Zybura, John S. *Present-Day Thinkers and the New Scholasticism*. St. Louis 1927.

B. PERIODICAL ARTICLES.

- Adler, Mortimer J. "The Next Twenty-five Years in Philosophy," *The New Scholasticism*, 25: 87-110, January, 1951.
- Bandera, Armando. "Pio XII y Santo Tomas," *La Ciencia Tomista*, 240-241: 483-543, Julio-Diciembre, 1951.
- Blas, Angel de. "Nature of Logic," *Unitas*, 23: 513-89, September, 1950.
- . "Essentials of Logic" *Unitas*, 23: 645-711, December, 1950.
- . "Essentials of Logic", *Unitas* 24: 35-74, March, 1951.
- Bonansea, Bernardino M. O.F.M., "Pioneers of the Nineteenth Century Scholastic Revival in Italy," *The New Scholasticism*, 28: 1-37, January, 1954.

- Collins, James. "A Quarter Century of American Philosophy," *The New Scholasticism*, 25: 46-80, January, 1951.
- Collins, James. "Toward a Philosophically Ordered Thomism," *The New Scholasticism*, 32: 301-326, July, 1958.
- Conrad-Martius, Hedwig. "Seele und Leib," *Hochland*, 42: 56-68, Oktober, 1949.
- De Raeymaeker, Louis. "Les Origines de l'Institut Supérieur de Louvain," *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, 49: 505-633, Novembre, 1951.
- Donlano, Thomas C. "The Beauty of God," *The Thomist*, 10: 185-225, April, 1947.
- Ehrle, Franx Card. "Die Encyclica Aeterni Patris," *Stimmen aus Maria Laach*, 18: 13-28; 292-317; 1880.
- . "Nuove proposte per lo studio dei manuscritti della scolastica medievale," *Gregorianum*, 3: 198-218, 1922.
- Follmann, M., "Scholastische und moderne Philosophie," *Theologisch-praktische Quartalschrift*, 75: 507-513, Oktober-Dezember, 1921.
- Grabmann, Martin. "The Influence of Medieval Philosophy on the Intellectual Life of Today," *The New Scholasticism*, 3: 24-56, January, 1929.
- Greck, A. "Mensch und Gesellschaft im Abendland," *Die Kirche in der Welt*, 4: 129-140, Januar, 1951.
- Hart, Charles A. "Twenty-five Years of Thomism," *The New Scholasticism*, 25: 3-45, January, 1951.
- Harnett, Joseph J. "Desiré Joseph Mercier and the Neo-Scholastic Revival," *The New Scholasticism*, 18: 303-333, October, 1944.
- Harvanek, Robert F. "The Crisis in Neo-Scholasticism," *Thought*, 38: 529-546, Winter 1963.
- Hellin, José. "Sana Libertad de la Filosofía Escolástica en la Encyclica "Humani Generis" y en Otros Documentos Ecclesiásticos," *Pensamiento*, 29: 53-73, Enero, 1952.
- Hengstenberg, H.E., "Das Sinnproblem in Metaphysik und Weltanschauung," *Die Kirche in der Welt*, 2: 215-222, 1949.
- Klubertanz, George P. "Where is the Evidence for Thomistic Metaphysics," *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, 54: 294-315, May, 1958.
- . "Aspekte zum Leib-Seele-Problem", *Die Kirche in der Welt*, 2: 381-384, 1949.
- Lauer, Rosemary. "Thomism Today," *The Commonweal*, 80: 39-42, April, 1964.
- Maritain, Jacques. "Personne et Individu," *Acta Pontificiae Academiae S. Thomae Aquinatis*, 12: 3-33, 1946.
- McCoal, Gerald A. "Recent Trends in German Scholasticism: Brunner and Lotz," *International Philosophical Quarterly*, 1: 668-682, December, 1961.
- Pelaez, Antonio, "La Escolastica y el Tomismo," *La Ciencia Tomista*, 31: 383-391, Enero, 1925.
- Ramirez, Santiago Maria, "The Authority of St. Thomas," *The Thomist*, 15: 1-109, Jan. 1952.
- Tambuyser, Raphael, "L'érection de la chair de philosophie thomiste a l'Université de Louvain," *Revue Philosophique de Louvain*, 54: 479-509, Août, 1958.

Van Stenberghen, Fernand. "Thomism in a Changing World," *The New Scholasticism*, 26: 37-48, January, 1952.

———. "Les études médiévales en Amérique," *Revue Philosophiques de Louvain*, 49: 407-414, Août, 1951.

Wyser, Paul. "Zur Neuen Série unserer Zeitschrift," *Freiburger Zeitschrift fuer Philosophie und Theologie*, 1: 3-16, 1954.

C. DOCUMENTS

Acta Apostolicae Sedis. 42 vols. Romae 1909.

Acta Sanctae Sedis. Vol. XII (1879); Vol. XIII (1880).

Denziger, Henricus, Clement Bannwart, Johannes Bapt. Umberg (eds.). *Enchiridion Symbolorum*. Editio 18-20; Friburgi Brisgoviae, 1932.

Gasparri, Petrus Card. (ed.). *Codex Iuris Canonici*. Romae 1933.

Leonis XIII, Pontificis Mar. Litterae Encyclicae duobus primis sui Pontificatus annis editae. Romae 1880.

D. ENCYCLOPEDIA ARTICLES

"Aristoteles," *Enciclopedia Universal Illustrada*, (Espasa), VI, 222.

Biglmair, A. "Romantik," *Lexikon fuer Theologie und Kirche*. Zweite, neubearbeitete Auflage, VIII, 967-971.

De Wulf, M. "Neo-Scholasticism," *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, X, 746-749.

Grabman, M. "Neuscholastik," *Lexikon fuer Theologie und Kirche*. Zweite, neubearbeitete Auflage, VII, 522-525.

Fitz G. et A. Michel. "La Néo-Scholastique" *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique*, VIV, 1725.

Goyan, G. "León XIII", *Dictionnaire de Théologie Catholique* IX, col. 353 f.

Kennedy, D. J., "Thomas", *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, edition of 1913, XIV, 663-76.

———. "Thomism", *The Catholic Encyclopedia*, XIV, 698-703.

APPENDIX I

Letter, dated 11 February 1898, of Cardinal Satolli, Prefect of the Congregation of Studies, to l'abbé Mercier. (Excerpts)

Je veux qu'un de mes premiers actes comme Préfet de la S. Congregation des Etudes soit de vous dire le profond intérêt que j'ai toujours porté a votre Institut....

Après cela, comment expliquer autrement que par un malentendu la phase aussi douloureuse pour vous que ruineuse pour votre œuvre qui a marqué ces derniers temps? Etant encore en Amérique, je pus en suivre tout le détail... et a peine nommé Préfet de la Congrégation des Etudes, j'en ai fait l'objet d'une enquête personnelle. Je ne puis disconvenir que l'article 15 de vos Statuts ne soit susceptible d'interprétations plus ou moins rigoureuses. Mai aussi, tout le monde devra convenir avec moi que, de toutes les interprétations, il faut choisir celle qui répond le mieux au caractère de votre Institut et au but général qui lui a été marqué... Or, j'estime (avec le plus grand respect pour les opinions qui ne concorderaient pas avec les miennes), j'estime que vous ne sortirez nullement de l'esprit de cet article si vous adoptez la méthode suivante, — qui était d'ailleurs à peu près, si je suis bien informé, celle que vous suiviez précédemment. Que, pour chacune des branches de la philosophie, les professeurs fassent une part, dans leur enseignement, à l'exposé et à l'analyse du texte même de saint Thomas, — j'entends du texte latin... Quant aux développements de la pensée personnelle du professeur; pour tout ce qui a trait à l'examen scientifique des faits d'où dérivent les lois et les principes; à la discussion des systèmes modernes; à la réfutation des objections tirées des sciences ou de la philosophie; il est très opportun dans un Institut comme celui de Louvain, que tous ces développements soient présentés en langue vulgaire.

Entrez donc de nouveau dans cette voie et marchez y avec courage et confiance, comptant sur tout l'appui de la S. Congrégation des Etudes, laquelle n'a qu'à se louer de voir à la tête d'un Institut qu'elle affectionne un homme que lui a donné de si éclatants témoignages de soumission et qui, éminent lui-même, a su grouper autour de lui des collaborateurs distingués.

Revue Philosophique de Louvain, 49:598-599,
November, 1951.

APPENDIX II

Importance and Influence of purity of life for the
penetration of higher truths.

Thomas Aquinas, like St. Augustine, Anselm of Canterbury, Hugo of St. Victor repeatedly called attention to the importance of ethico-religious dispositions for an effective penetration into supersensible and supernatural truths. Plato already understood and expressed this insight that thorough and complete cognition of the True and the Divine is possible only to the pure soul detached from the sensuous. Thomas lived himself according to what he taught on the relation of moral purity to love for God; and the relation of the seven gifts of the Holy Ghost to the theological speculation. The scientific consideration of St. Thomas cannot be well separated from his ethico-religious greatness of soul. The researcher and thinker in Thomas cannot be understood without the saint in him...

In the spiritual life of the medieval thinkers we so often perceive touching manifestations of nobility of heart, which you look for in vain in the lives of modern scientists...

The basic disposition of the spiritual life of the Saint (Thomas) : the devotion to the Supersensible and Divine, and the sabbath-rest of the meek, humble heart communicated itself also to the scientific life and endeavor of the Doctor, and determined his scientific individuality.

Grabmann, *Thomas von Aquin* (Muenchen: Joseph Koesel & Fr. Pustet, 1935), pp. 34 & 38 respectively.

Cfr. also J. M. Scheeben, *Die Mysterien des Christentums* (Mainz: Matthias Gruenewald, 1931), pp. 734-38. Or its translation by Cyril Vellert, *The Mysteries of Christendom* (St. Louis: Herder, 1947), pp. 770 ff.

And Pius XI, "Studiorum Ducem", A.A.S., XV (1923), p. 315.

S. Th., I, q. 1, a. 6 ad 3; II-II, q. 45, a. 2.

INDEX OF NAMES

- Abril, Pedro Simon, 91
 Adler, Mortimer, 71, 74, 139, 202
 Aegidius de Roma, 90
 Agripa, Cornelius, 9
 Albertus Magnus, 27, 40, 56, 76, 87,
 113, 119, 133, 163, 191
 Alexander, H.B., 3, 5, 6
 Alexander of Hales, 90, 119, 147
 Alexander, S., VII
 Alfarabi, 115
 Algazel, 115
 Alkindi, 115
 Aloisianum, 34
 Alonso, Francisco, 91
 Altaner, Berthold, 159
 Alvarez, Baltazar, 92
 Anselm of Canterbury, 13, 62, 146
 Antonio de la Madre de Dios, 91
 Arauxo, Francisco de, 91
 Arintero, P.G., 50
 Arislides, 160
 Aristotle, 9, 15, 26, 27, 36, 57, 76,
 87, 113, 119, 133, 163, 191
 Arnaiz, M., 50
 Arnauld, 31
 Arnobius, 160
 Ashley, Benedict, 73
 Astudillo, Diego de, 91
 Athanagoras, 160
 Athanasius, 160
 Augustine, St., 89, 108, 111, 161
 Avencebrol, 116
 Averroes, 34, 90, 115, 176
 Avicebron, 116
 Avicenna, 116
 Azarias, Brother, 68

 Bacelaere, Edward G.L. Van, 67
 Backer, 62
 Baeumker, Klemens, 53, 120
 Ballerini, 46
 Balmes, Jaime, 48, 51
 Bañez, Domingo, 91, 150
 Barbado, 50
 Barberini, 99
 Barbeus, 50
 Barthelemy de Saint-Hilaire, 93
 Bartholomew of Messina, 88
 Basil, 160
 Baudrillart, A., 20
 Baumgartner Al., 109
 Baumgartner, Matthias, 53
 Baur, Aug., 16
 Baur, Ludwig, 53
 Bazewell, Charles M., 5, 20
 Beneden, Van, 63
 Benedict XIV, 101
 Benedict XV, 101
 Bergson, 59
 Biglmair, A., 83
 Billuart, 40
 Binder, Charles, 27
 Bittle, Celestine, 69
 Blake, Charles, 3
 Blake, Ralph M., 3
 Blanch, Jose, 91
 Blanche, P., 58
 Blas, Angel de, 110
 Blondel, M., 59
 Boccaccio, 22
 Boehmer, I.F., 84
 Boedder, Bernard, 55, 66
 Boethius, 161
 Boetius of Dacia, 200
 Bonansea, Bernardino M., 42, 44, 45
 Bonaventura, 90, 142, 149, 150,
 158, 165
 Bonitz, 84, 93
 Bonnelty, D., 96
 Bonriot, Joseph, 57
 Borghese, 99
 Bourquard, Msgr. 57
 Bouquillon, Thomas, 183
 Boylesve, 58
 Brentano, 84, 105
 Brett, G.S., 6
 Buchanan, Scott, 71
 Burgos, 50
 Buzzotti, Vincenzo, 42, 43

 Cajetan, (Tomas de Vio), 91
 Cano, Melchior, 39
 Capozza, 46
 Carnoy, 63
 Carreras y Artau, 50
 Castelein, 62
 Cathrein, Victor, 55
 Chaignet, 93
 Charcot, 63
 Chateaubriand, F.R. de, 84
 Chauver, 93
 Chiesa, Luis della, 46
 Chrysostom, Brother, 68
 Chrysostum, 160
 Clark, 68
 Clarke, Richard F., 66
 Clemens, Jacob, 52
 Clement of Alexandria, 160
 Clement IV, 190, 196
 Clerval, 58
 Coconnier, Thomas, 57

- Coffey, Peter, 65, 66, 78, 119
 Collins, James, 67
 Comellas, y Cluet, Antonio, 48
 Commer, Ernst, 53, 61
 Comte, 140, 176
 Condillac, 42
 Copleston, Frederick, 113, 116
 Coppens, Charles, 68
 Cornaldi, Giovanni-Maria, 45, 46,
 170
 Coronat, Melchior, 91
 Cortes, Donoso, 84
 Cousin, Victor, 44
 Crockaert, Peter, 39
 Cuevas, Jose Fernandez, 48
 Curci, Carlo Maria, 43

 David of Dinant, 117
 Davis, Ch.S., 66, 69
 De Broglie, 57
 De Harlez, 63
 De Wulf, Maurice, 25, 27, 64, 71,
 78, 84, 88, 110, 114, 116, 118, 142
 Dechamps, Card., 62, 169
 Degl' Innocenti, Humbert, 73
 Delmas, Charles, 57
 Denifle, Heinrich, 53, 54
 Denis, 94
 Denzinger, 96
 Deploige, S., 65
 Desaulniers, 71
 Descartes, 42, 59, 140, 176
 Dewey, John, 37
 Dilthey, Wilhelm, 14
 Dolz, 90
 Domet de Vorges, 57, 58
 Dominguez, Dionisio, 39, 47, 49, 88
 Donat, Joseph, 7
 Dondeyne, Albert, 65
 Driesch, 107
 Driscoll, 68
 Droste-Vishering, 58
 Du Roussaux, 182, 182
 Duhem, P., 31
 Duns Scotus, 29, 30, 90, 119, 142,
 149, 150, 200
 Dupont, 62
 Durandus, 30, 87, 201

 Egger, B., 92
 Ehrle, Franz, Card., 28, 30, 31, 36,
 40, 48, 147, 196
 Enzinas, 90
 Epicurus, 117
 Erasmus, 9
 Ercilla, Ngarte de, 50
 Esser, Gerard, 69
 Ettlinger, Max, 107
 Euken, Rud., 15, 107
 Everett, Walter Goodnow, 7, 8

 Farges, Albert, 57
 Feuerbach, 82
 Fichte, 79, 80, 176
 Finance, Joseph de, 73
 Fischer, 55
 Fonsegrive, Georges, 57
 Fourier, 81
 Francisco de Toledo, 91
 Fremont, 57
 Frick, Karl, 55
 Friedrich, Franz, 51
 Frohschammer, J., 7, 96
 Fuerstenberg, Wilhelm von, 51

 Galitzin, Amelia, 51
 Garcia y Caballero, 50
 Gardair, J., 57
 Garrigou-Lagrange, Reg., 48, 58,
 121
 Gaspar Cardillo de Villalpando, 91
 Gehuchten, Van, 63
 Geissel, von Card., 96
 Gemelli, Ag., 46, 47
 Geny, Paul, 145
 Geyer, Bernhard, 53
 Geysler, Joseph, 53, 55
 Gilson, Etienne, 9, 57, 59, 60, 71,
 73, 114, 116, 132
 Giorgio, de, 46
 Glossner, 55
 Gmeiner, 68, 69
 Goerres, 84
 Goerresgesellschaft, 55
 Goes, Manuel, 91
 Goethe, 85
 Gonzales, Ceferino Card., 48, 49
 Goossens, Card., 172, 180
 Goudin, Antoine, 42
 Grabmann, Martin, 10, 14, 17, 31,
 52, 54, 86, 89, 94, 119, 145,
 164, 190
 Grand-Claude, 58
 Greck, A., 37
 Gredt, Jos., 48, 55, 107
 Gregorio, Arcisio, 91
 Gregory of Nazianz, 160
 Gregory of Nyssa, 160
 Gregory VII (Hildebrand), 36
 Gregory IX, 150
 Gregory X, 196
 Grimm, 84
 Grosseteste, Robert, 88, 189
 Gruber, Hermann, 54
 Gruender, 55, 68
 Grunwald, 55
 Gutberlet, Konstantin, 52, 55
 Gutierrez, Alfonso, 91
 Guenther, 96

 Haan, 55
 Hagemann, George, 53
 Hammond, Lewis, 71

- Harnett, Joseph J., 62, 138
 Harper, Thomas, 66
 Hart, Charles A., 40, 60, 67, 69, 71
 Hartmann, Ed. von, 107
 Haureau, 94
 Havet, 94
 Havranck, Robert F., 53, 72
 Hegel, 80, 84, 94, 176
 Hellin, 205
 Herbart, 94
 Hergenroether, Jos. Card., 99, 112
 Herman the German, 88
 Hermes, 160
 Henry de Dorladot, 173
 Henry IV, 36
 Henry of Ghent, 148, 200
 Henry of Harclay, 30
 Henry, Louis, 63
 Hertling, Georg von, 53, 54, 94
 Hertwig, O., 107
 Hill, Walter, 68
 Hinman, E.L., 6
 Hocking, William Ernest, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8
 Hoefer, Joseph, 53
 Hoernle, R.F. Alfred, VII
 Holaind, R.I., 68
 Holcot, 27
 Hugon, 48
 Hulst, M.d', 100
 Humboldt, W. von, 84
 Hume, 140
 Husserl, Edmund, 105
 Huxley, 1

 Irinaeus, 160
 Innocent VI, 197

 Jacobini, Card., 180
 Jaeger, Werner, 94
 Janet, 94
 Jansen, B., 55, 56, 92, 107, 145
 Janssen, J., 84
 Johann von Lachsen, 51
 John Damascene, 161
 John Hus, 34
 John of Jandum, 43
 John Peckham, 200
 Jouin, 68
 Joyce, George H., 66
 Juan de Santo Tomas, 91
 Juan de Vergara, 91
 Justin the Martyr, 159
 Justinian, 112

 Kant, Immanuel, 79, 140, 176
 Katerkamp, 51
 Kearney, 68
 Kellermann, 51
 Kenedy, 68
 Kennedy, 201
 Kilwardby, Robert, 201

 Kleutgen, Jos., 12, 18, 45, 52, 171
 Klimke, Federiko, II, 16, 46, 48,
 49, 91, 92
 Kremer, R., 145
 Kuelpe, Oswald, 106, 107

 Lactantius, 160
 Lahousse, Gust., 62
 Lammenai de, 44, 84
 Lauer, Rosemary, 11, 74
 Leclercq, Jacques, 65
 Lehmen, 55
 Leibniz, 106, 176
 Leighton, Joseph A., 3
 Leo XIII, 62, 67, 71, 72, 82, 96, 135,
 146, 149, 150, 158, 162, 163,
 165, 187, 203
 Lepidi, Alberto, 45, 46, 62
 Leprune, 96
 Lewes, George Henry, 96
 Liberatore, Mateo, 43, 46, 57, 170
 Lista y Aragon, A.R. de, 84
 Loeffler, Klemens, 98
 Locke, 42
 Longwell, H.C., 3, 6, 8
 Lorenzelli, Benito, 45, 46
 Lortia, Stanislaus A., 11
 Lotz, 53
 Lotze, Hermann, 106
 Luca, Cardinal de, 151, 167
 Lucretius, 117
 Lull, Raymond, 49
 Lupus, 62

 MacDonald, Alexander, 71
 Maffreti, 27
 Magelliano, 92
 Mainage, 57
 Mainong, 105
 Maistre, J. de, 84
 Malebranche, 31
 Mammaltrect, 27
 Mandonnet, Pierre, 58
 Manser, Galus, 53, 60, 117, 149
 Mansion, Paul, 63, 93, 95
 Manzoni, 84
 Maquart, F.X., 145
 Maréchal, J., 65
 Maritain, Jacques, 9, 58, 59, 71,
 75, 79
 Martigne, Prosp. de, 58
 Martinez de Prado, Juan, 91
 Marx, 109
 Mas, Diego, 91
 Masdeu, Baltazar, 42
 Mazella, Card., 181, 182
 McCool, Gerard, 53
 McCormick, John, 40
 Mead, George H., 6
 Medio, P. de, 50
 Meinel, Friedrich, 145

Mendez y Pelayo M., 48, 90
 Mendioe, Jose, 48
 Mercado, Tomas, 91
 Mercier, Desiree Card., VI, 62, 64,
 110, 134, 143, 169, 170, 177,
 202, 208
 Meuffels, Hubert, 186
 Meyer, Hans, 94
 Michalski, Konstantin, 54
 Michelitsch, Anton, 54
 Mielle, P., 57
 Mignen, 58
 Miguel de Palacios, 91
 Miller, F. x., 145
 Ming, John, 68
 Moerbecke, William, 189
 Moher, Michel, 68
 Moleschott, 82
 Molière, 31
 Morabethes, 115
 Morgott, Franz, 52
 Moses Maimonides, 116
 Munnynk, P. de, 61

Nava di Bontife, 182
 Newman, John Henry, Card., 99,
 202
 Niebuhr, 84
 Nietzsche, 81
 Noel, Léon, 58, 59, 63, 65, 94, 98,
 145, 166
 Novalis, 84
 Nuñez, Pedro Juan, 91
 Nys, D., 64, 143

Ockam, William of, 29, 31, 34, 142,
 168
 Olgiati, 46, 47
 Olive, Pierre, 176
 Origenes, 160
 Ortí y Hara, Juan M., 48
 Ortiz, Diego, 91
 Overberg, 51

Pace, 68, 69
 Palnics, 50
 Pastor, Ludwig, 19, 23
 Paulsen, Friedrich, 7, 13, 107
 Pecci, Giuseppe, 43, 170, 182
 Pedro de Fouseca, 91
 Pedro Martinez de Brea, 91
 Pedro de Oña, 91
 Pedro de Oviedo, 91
 Peillaube, 57, 58
 Peinado, Ignacio Francisco, 91
 Pelster, Franz, 53, 54
 Penjon, M., 8, 76
 Perry, Ralph Barton, 4, 5, 6, 7
 Pesch, 55
 Petrarca, 22
 Petrus Aureoli, 30

Petrus Lombardus, 39, 200
 Phelan, Gerald B., 71
 Phillips, R.P., 67, 127
 Piat, Claude, 57, 58
 Picavet, M., 59
 Pieper, Joseph, 53
 Pierron, 93
 Pius IX, VI, 96, 196
 Pius X, 100, 150, 196
 Pius XI, VI, 101, 102, 196
 Pius XII, 102, 187, 189, 195, 203
 Plassmann, Hermann Ernst, 53
 Plato, 8, 7, 92, 111, 119, 163, 164,
 176
 Plaza de Fresneda, Cristobal, 91
 Poland, 68
 Prado, Norberto del, 50
 Pratt, James B., II, 6
 Prezzalini, Giuseppe, 47
 Pricot, 27
 Prisco, Giuseppe, 170
 Proudhon, 81
 Pulgar, P. del, 50
 Pusey, 202

Quadratus, 160

Raeymaecker, Louis de, 40, 42, 45,
 46, 62, 65, 72, 81, 169, 173
 Ragay, P., 58
 Ramirez, Santiago, 50, 188, 196
 Ranke, Leopold von, 84
 Ravaisson, 93
 Ray, Punya Sloka, 10
 Regnon, Theodore, 57
 Reinstadler, 55
 Reinke, 107
 Renan, 94
 Ricardus de Bury, 33
 Rickaby, John, 66
 Rickaby, Joseph, 66
 Rinaldini, Msgr., 181
 Ritter, H., 16
 Robert, Abbe, 71
 Rolland-Gosselin, M., 58
 Rosa, Martinez de la, 84
 Rosselli, Salvatore, 40, 42
 Rosset, M., 58
 Rubio, Antonio, 91
 Ruiz, Francisco, 91
 Runes, Dagobert D., 83
 Russo, Nicholas, 68
 Ryan, James H., 139, 145

Saavedra, Angel de, 84
 Sabatier, Aug., 16
 Saint-Simon, 81
 San, Luis de, 62
 Sanseverino, Gaetano, 44, 57
 Santayana, George, 4
 Satolli, Francisco, 45, 46, 182

- Saune, Henri, 57
 Schelling, 80
 Schiffini, Santos, 45, 46
 Schlegel, 84
 Schmidlin, Jos., 169
 Schmidt, Wilhelm, 55
 Schneid, Matthias, 52
 Schuetz, Ludwig, 53
 Schulte, A., 84
 Schulte, Karl Joseph Card., 56
 Schwegler, 93
 Scot, Michael, 88
 Scotus, Erigena, 116
 Seeborg, 98
 Seppelt, Franz, 98
 Sertillanges, A., 57, 58
 Sewis, 46
 Shanahan, 68, 69
 Sheen, Fulton, 68, 69, 100
 Sheldon, Wilmon H., 3, 5, 6
 Signoriello, Nuncio, 45
 Sigor de Brabant, 176, 200
 Sillem, Edward A., 27
 Silvestre, Francisco, 91
 Simeterre, M., 58
 Simon, J., 94
 Sixtus V, 158, 162
 Smith, W.K., 71
 Socrates, 164
 Sordi, Domenico, 43
 Sordi, Serafino, 43
 Soto, Domingo de, 91
 Spencer, 140, 176
 Spinoza, 44
 Steffes, J.P., 56
 Steenberghen, Ferdinand van, 65,
 202
 Stein, Edith, 105
 Steinbuechl, Theodor, 21
 Stiglmayer, Jos., 92
 Stirner, Max, 81, 83
 Stoecke, Albert, 18, 26, 52, 55, 89,
 94, 106
 Stolberg, L. von, 51
 Strigl, Anton, 149
 Suarez, I, 55, 91, 150
 Switalski, W., 83
 Symphorien-Louis, 71

 Talamo, Salvatore, 45, 46, 170
 Tambuyser, 62, 170
 Taparelli, Luigi, 43, 47
 Tauchnitz, 93
 Taylor, A.E., 3, 4, 20
 Taylor, 94
 Teresia Renata de Spiritu Sancto,
 105, 106
 Tertullian, 160
 Teubner, 93
 Thomas Aquinas, IV, 21, 25, 26,
 27, 34, 39, 40, 44, 51, 55, 56, 57,
 59, 62, 73, 82, 88, 89, 90, 97,
 113, 117, 119, 124, 129, 133,
 147, 150, 158, 163, 165, 200
 Thomas Bradwardine, 34, 35
 Thurot, 93
 Tieck, 84
 Tomas de Vio (Cajetan), 91
 Tomasius, 9
 Tompier, Stephan, 200
 Tongiorgi, Salvatore, 45, 171
 Tonquedeo, J. de, 57
 Travaglini, 46
 Trendelenburg, 84, 94
 Tribbechovius, 37
 Troeltsch, 107
 T'Serglaes, Msgr. de, 177
 Turner, William, 49, 68, 69, 80

 Ubahgs, G.C., 62
 Ueberweg, Friedrich, III, 28, 31,
 34, 54, 55
 Urban IV, 196
 Urmson, James Opie, 10
 Urraburu, Jose, 48, 49

 Vacherot, 94
 Vallet, P., 58, 93
 Van der Aa, 62
 Vannutelli, Vincenzo Card.
 Villard, 57
 Villeneuve, J.M.R. Card., 204
 Vittoria, Francisco, 39, 91
 Vives, Luis, 9, 90
 Vogt, 82
 Voisine, M., 58

 Walker, Leslie,
 Wallace, Ed., 94
 Weddingen, A. van, 62, 151
 Werner, Karl, 52
 William of Alnwick, 30
 William de la Mare, 200
 William of St. Amour, 200
 William of Moerbeke, 88
 William of Tocco, 190
 William of Ware, 200
 Willmann, Otto, 12, 16, 18, 38, 54,
 94, 137, 193
 Windischinann, H., 52
 Windle, Sir Bertram, 1
 Wundt, Wilhelm, 50, 107, 176
 Wust, Peter, 106, 108
 Wyser, P., 61

 Zacario, Martinez, 50
 Zaragueta, Juan, 50
 Zeller, E., 84, 93
 Zevort, 93
 Zigliara, Tommaso, 45, 46, 99, 170
 Zybura, John S., 2, 38

[illegible]

DEMCO, INC. 38-2931

B
839
W38

349217

GRADUATE THEOLOGICAL UNION LIBRARY
BERKELEY, CA 94709

B839 .W38

GTU Library

G

Watzlawik, Joseph/Leo XIII and the new s



3 2400 00002 0416

